

ROMANCE NOTES



VOLUME I, NUMBER 2

SPRING, 1960

ROMANCE NOTES

Urban Tigner Holmes, Jr., General Editor

Sturgis Elleno Leavitt

Alfred Garvin Engstrom

Nicholson Barney Adams

Jacques Hardré

Sterling Aubrey Stoudemire

Richard Lane Frautschi

John Esten Keller

Lawrence Albright Sharpe

Karl-Ludwig Selig, Managing Editor

VOLUME I, NUMBER 2

SPRING, 1960

- Zorrilla: a Small Poet and a Big Horse.*
Nicholson Barney Adams 81
- Camus' Absurd Don Juan.* Gerald E. Wade 85
- Willa Cather's The Professor's House and Anatole France's
Le Mannequin d'Ossier.*
Wolfgang Bernard Fleischmann 92
- Nota sobre un Poema de Herrera y Reissig.*
Bernardo Gicovate 94
- Eucharistic Symbols in the Poetry of Julio Herrera y Reissig.*
Raymond Souza 97
- Benavente and Shakespearian Drama.* Kessel Schwartz 101
- Paul Verlaine and Dioscorides on Poetry and the Scent of
Thyme.*
Alfred G. Engstrom 106
- Maupassant's Bel-Ami and Balzac.* Milton Chaikin 109

ROMANCE NOTES

VOLUME I, NUMBER 2

SPRING, 1960

ZORRILLA: A SMALL POET AND A BIG HORSE

By NICHOLSON BARNEY ADAMS

JOSÉ ZORRILLA, first and only child of Don José Zorrilla Caballero, age 39, and Doña Nicomedes Moral, age 30, was born in Valladolid on February 21, 1817. He was premature, so puny at birth that the attending physician, Dr. Lucas Dueñas, immediately christened him with *agua de socorro*. Nine days later he was formally baptized and given the names José Maximiano Zorrilla y Moral.¹

The poet never forgot that he was a premature infant, and he often referred to his extremely small size as an adult. The two facts were undoubtedly connected in his mind.² Since the average height of adult male Spaniards is reported to be very close to 5 ft. 5 in., Zorrilla must indeed have been tiny by most standards. The actor Carlos Latorre was less than six feet tall, but Zorrilla refers to him as *El gigante* and to himself as a *muchacho*

1. Alonso Cortés, N., *Zorrilla: su vida y sus obras* (Valladolid, 1916) 1 pp. 10, 16, 22.

2. It is a fair presumption that Zorrilla's prematurity had nothing to do with his small stature. Premature infants who survive catch up to "normal" measurements, for example, those of their siblings, within a period of months or perhaps longer. See Hess, Julius H., Mohr, George J., and Barthelme, Phyllis F., *The Physical and Mental Growth of Prematurely Born Children* (Chicago, 1934).

pigmeo.³ Latorre used to dandle the poet on his knee.⁴ In his account of meeting García Gutiérrez, Zorrilla refers to his own "pálida y exigua personalidad."⁵ When, after several years of separation, Zorrilla and his father ("viejo robusto y de elevada estatura") were reunited, the elder Zorrilla picked the now successful poet and playwright up in his arms, and, on putting him down said: "¡Qué chiquitín te has quedado!"⁶ When the Second Part of *El zapatero y el rey* was advertised (1841), Zorrilla was impressed because: "... el nombre del poeta más pequeño que había en España apareció en las letras más grandes que en cartel de teatros hasta entonces se habían impreso."⁷

Zorrilla knew he was small and was afraid of being weak. Hence the exercises in which he indulged: "La gimnasia, que necesitaba mi sietemesina naturaleza, el tiro de pistola, que en tiempos tan revueltos no era inútil estudio, y los paseos a caballo fuera de puertas, eran mis perennes entretenimientos."⁸ Incidentally, Ferrer del Río refers to these and other pursuits of the poet as "diversiones propias de un niño."⁹

These lines are meant to emphasize the obvious suggestion that Zorrilla was constantly striving to compensate for his smallness by doing something big. His total literary output was extremely bulky. In some of his poems and *leyendas* and in most of his plays, he loves to present either good or evil characters who are impressively strong and vigorous, who hold the reins of the action in their powerful hands. Don Juan Tenorio is not the only character who is practically invincible to men and irresistible to women. The implausibly melodramatic action in Zorrilla's plays might parallel the author's pleasure in the loud noise of pistol shots.

Perhaps an even more important unconscious symbol for the little poet is the horse. Such suggestions have nothing to do with the author's incurable sentimentality. One of Zorrilla's first memories was of seeing a statue of St. Martin on a white horse,

3. Zorrilla, José, *Recuerdos del tiempo viejo* (Barcelona, 1880), I, 74.

4. Zorrilla, *Recuerdos*, I, 83.

5. Zorrilla, *Recuerdos*, I, 31. See also p. 118.

6. Zorrilla, *Recuerdos*, I, 226.

7. Zorrilla, *Recuerdos*, I, 66.

8. Zorrilla, *Recuerdos*, I, 50.

9. Ferrer del Río, A., *Galería de la literatura española* (Madrid, 1846).

at the high altar of the parish church to which his mother took him every day. The child longed to have a sword and a horse like the Saint, and his stern father showed one of his few signs of tenderness by bringing his son a heavy cardboard horse and a tin sword. Zorrilla says: "Los caballos y las espadas fueron, pues, los dos primeros juguetes con que mi niñez se entretuvo."¹⁰

Zorrilla's self-importance, evident throughout his memoirs, whether he is putting his best foot forward or praising himself in reverse by belittlement, was evident at a very early age. One winter morning when the young boy was on his balcony over the solitary street in Valladolid, he saw a vision: a great, white horse strode by, and the rider bowed to the boy on the balcony.¹¹ Ferrer confirms the report of the boy's tendency toward self-aggrandizement: when a childish companion said: "Vamos a jugar a los soldados; yo seré general: —Zorrilla contestaba con presteza: —Juguemos, tú serás general: yo seré rey."¹²

Zorrilla had learned riding—and produced many youthful verses—during his years at the Seminario de Nobles. When in 1836, he had failed his law courses and was being sent home in disgrace, it was a horse that helped him to escape to Madrid and to a better than academic life. He spent the night with a cousin in Torquemada, saw a mare grazing in a field belonging to the cousin, mounted the mare, and took the stagecoach to Madrid and to future glory.¹³ The story of his springing into prominence by reciting his verses at the grave of Larra, who committed suicide on Feb. 13, 1837, has been often told.

In the capital, Zorrilla continued his exercises on horseback. One ride was particularly significant for his literary production. Another cousin, Protasio Zorrilla, had given him a big, spirited black Andalusian stallion. One afternoon, when he was riding the horse on the Calle del Baño, the horse held his head so high and had such a heavy mane that the little rider, whose feet did not even reach his horse's belly, could not be seen from the front. A *chulo* called out from the corner: "Pues miá que es idea dejar a un animal tan hermoso andar sin jinete." At the moment

10. Zorrilla, *Recuerdos* (Madrid, 1882), II, 39-40.

11. Zorrilla, *Recuerdos*, II, 41-42.

12. Ferrer del Río, *Galería*, 289.

13. Zorrilla, *Recuerdos*, I, 23; Alonso Cortés, *Zorrilla*, I, 106; Ferrer del Río, *Galería*, 276-7.

the actor and director Juan Lombía was pressing Zorrilla for a play, and Zorrilla tells us that it was on this ride that the idea occurred to him of using the theme of the horse of Don Sancho el Mayor of Navarre as a dramatic theme. The result was *El caballo del rey don Sancho*, shown Nov. 11, 1843. (Zorrilla remembers it as 1840 or 1841.) Back home, the poet looked up the story in Mariana, planned the play, including the grandiose tournament scene at the end, went to see Lombía the same evening, and secured the actor's assent. Unfortunately he did not consult the big, black horse. At his first rehearsal, the horse went up the ramp docilely enough, but on seeing the stage and especially the proscenium lights, snorted, bucked and refused to participate in the foolishness. Actors and playwright were about to give up the whole idea, but a friend, Dr. Avilés, kindly lent an impressive looking but very gentle *caballo isabelino* (light bay) who turned out to be a more cooperative actor, quite willing to wear the heavy caparison and armor lent by the then Duke of Osuna. The three hundred (!) *comparsas* did their collective best, Lombía and Bárbara Lamadrid played their parts at least to the hilt, and Zorrilla claims that such applause had never before thundered through the Teatro de la Cruz.¹⁴ The critics were less impressed, and the play, partly because of obvious production problems, did not remain in the repertory. However, the poet's aspirations toward bigness should have been temporarily satisfied. Surely few other dramas can have been conceived on the back of a big horse.¹⁵

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

14. Zorrilla, *Recuerdos*, I, 86-9.

15. This brief paper prescinds from certain other interesting questions, such as the appearance of animals on the stage from the Golden Age onward, and the history of the legend of Don Sancho of Navarre and of previous dramatizations. Zorrilla probably used only Mariana as a source. One may profitably consult Menéndez y Pelayo's introduction to *El testimonio vengado* in vol. VII (1897) of the *Obras de Lope de Vega*, where suggestions will also be found with regard to Moreto's treatment in *Cómo se vengan los nobles*. García Gutiérrez also used part of the legend in *El bastardo* (1848). See also Stanley T. Ballenger, *The Legend of the Horse of Don Sancho el Mayor in Spanish Literature*, unpublished Master's Thesis, the University of North Carolina, 1933.

CAMUS' ABSURD DON JUAN

By GERALD E. WADE

AMONG THE MANY attempts to interpret the character of Don Juan is that made by the late Albert Camus. In *Le Mythe de Sisyphe*,¹ the prestigious French novelist, dramatist, essayist, and Nobel Prize winner offered a short chapter on "Le Don Juanisme" that may perhaps have escaped the attention of Hispanists and those interested especially in the Don Juan creation of Tirso de Molina.² It is when Camus sees in Tirso's Don Juan one of the three principal types of men who in his opinion best substantiate the thesis of his book that *tirsistas* develop added interest.³

It is necessary to offer a brief résumé of Camus' book in order to understand his comments on Don Juan. Camus, one of the greatly disillusioned men of our time, a complete atheist who had no belief in God or in the possibility of a life to come, felt the desperate need to try to make sense of an existence that must be justified, if at all, in the here and now. As expressed in *Sisyphe*, he failed to find any meaning for life except its very meaninglessness. He repudiated the effort of Husserl and his phenomenologist followers to argue a unity for the universe and for human life in spite of the (to Camus) lack of evidence for it. Since there is no unity, and since man is faced with a life that metaphysically makes no sense, life is absurd. Man is absurd, too. He can of course seek a "solution" in suicide, but Camus rejects this. He rejects it because he insists on the efficacy and the validity of human pride for giving man courage to face his desperate situation.

Man, then, having used his reason (as far as it will take him)⁴

1. Albert Camus, *Le Mythe de Sisyphe. Essai sur l'absurde* (Paris, 1942).

2. As portrayed in *El burlador de Sevilla*, first published in 1630.

3. It is specifically the Tirsian Don Juan to which Camus makes reference. On page 99 of his *Sisyphe* Camus refers by name and title to Tirso's drama: "Le 'Burlador' de Molina."

4. It is not clear in his *Sisyphe* just how far Camus is willing to use his reason as his guide. At least to some degree, he is among those thinkers who in our time employ reason to deny reason's efficacy in the solution of the metaphysical problems that bedevil existence.

to discover that life has no meaning, and fully conscious of his fate, which is nothingness beyond the grave, may exert his pride to live out the absurd existence to which he is chained. He should not, however, be reconciled to his fate, and should feel and live a constant revolt against it. It is this revolt that gives life whatever value it may have. Through his revolt man gives proof of his only truth, which is defiance.⁵ Inasmuch as this life is the only one man will ever have, he should live it to the full, should experience everything. Rejecting any moral code whereby to postulate a scale of values, he should substitute quantity for quality.⁶ No man can be guilty of wrong or evil; man is inevitably innocent. Man cannot be moral, but he can be *responsible*. (Camus does not make the term's meaning entirely clear.) The only truth he needs to follow is that which comes to life and develops in men. "It is not ethical rules that the absurd mind should seek as the goal of its reasoning, but the breath of human lives." (*Sisyphus*, page 95)

It is in and through human lives, therefore, that Camus finds the answer to life's meaning for him; that is, its absurdity. To him there are three types of men that best illustrate life in its quantitative living, its lack of moral scruple, its revolt against fate. The first of these types is that exemplified by Don Juan. The other two are those of the professional actor and the conqueror.⁷ Camus states that in the three he is offering the lives of

5. Just as Sisyphus, condemned to roll his stone through eternity to the top of a hill only to see it roll to the bottom again, may find life desirable, even exultantly livable, through his revolt against his fate's senselessness, through his masculine strength that takes pleasure in exerting itself, through his very experience of all that life has to offer him.

6. In this Camus follows the phenomenologists in their ascription of an equal value to each and every one of life's manifestations.

7. We shall not take space here to explain Camus' attitude toward the actor and the conqueror. But attention should be called to his statement in a later volume (*L'Homme Révolté*, Paris, 1952, page 19) that offers an apparent repudiation of his thesis that Don Juan is a type of his absurd man: "the absurd is in itself a contradiction. It is contradictory in its content because it excludes value judgments in wanting to uphold life, since to live is in itself a value judgment. To breathe is to judge. It is perhaps not true to say that life is a perpetual choice. But it is true that one cannot imagine a life deprived of all choice. From this simple point of view, the absurdist position, as an act, is not to be conceived of. It is equally inconceivable as an expression." Camus, then, repudiated his absurdist position and, of logical necessity, his conviction

men who aim to expend themselves: "in the absurd world the value of a life is measured [negatively] by its sterility." (*Sisyphé*, page 96)

This, then, is the summary, far too brief for an adequate elucidation, of all of Camus' *Sisyphé* except his chapter on Don Juanism. In his book, as we have seen, he establishes norms by which to judge a man absurd. To recapitulate, his absurd man is filled with revolt against an existence that for him has no meaning, he lives his revolt pridefully and, unremorseful and scornful of moral law, indulges in every possible kind of experience—and as fully as possible. Back of all his thoughts and acts is his complete atheism, his denial of God or of a life to come.

Camus' chapter on Don Juanism actually adds little to clarify the libertine's philosophy and psychology, since the fundamentals of these aspects of his existence had been established in previous pages. But Camus reminds us in the chapter that Don Juan seeks love to the point of satiety; he savors life with maximum zest, is never melancholy but always joyous. He deliberately provokes Hell, says Camus, having but one reply to divine wrath, his honor. He is really a very ordinary seducer except that he is very conscious of what he is doing (as an absurd man should be). Being entirely innocent, he can feel no guilt or regret. Camus admits he is selfish, "à sa façon." This admission is as far as Camus will go in giving any thought at all to the unfortunate consequences for Don Juan's victims.

We shall not take issue with Camus' right to the interpretation of Don Juan as the absurd man described above; it is his privilege to do as he will with him, to recast Don Juan in a mold of his own fashioning. There is, indeed, no limit to an interpretation of the human psyche except the boundaries of one's imagination, restrained by common sense, decorum and taste. It is inevitable that as man's comprehension of (or at least his capacity to raise questions about) the hidden parts of the human personality grows with time, he should see in himself and his fellow creatures many things that earlier students could not have

that Don Juan is an absurd figure. But as far as we know, he did not disavow his admiration for the libertine, and we shall assume that his espousal of the type as a model for human conduct always retained for him a certain validity. At the least, it represents one stage of Camus' thought on the subject of life's meaning.

dreamed of. Camus may be permitted his imaginings, so representative are they of an enlightened and terribly disillusioned Frenchman of our mid-century, even though not all of Camus' readers may choose to accept his findings.

Now Camus in his reconstitution of Don Juan's character has rejected Tirso's fabrication of the *burlador's* psychology in a number of its major aspects. In effect he is saying to Tirso: "I should not try to insist that every libertine be an absurd man; I do not mean that a man cannot be a true libertine unless he is my absurd man. But I should like to insist that the absurd man finds in the Don Juan you invented one of his greatest possibilities of expression; that if the libertine is absurd, he can express himself more adequately, can love more efficiently, relax more conscience-free. Let me, therefore, show you how the libertine should be fashioned by a dramatic artist in accord with my formula. As he is by his very nature an absurd man, he is bound by no religious ethic, by no moral code. Hence he cannot be held to account for deeds that, since evil does not exist, have no element of wrong in them. It is ridiculous, unfair and pointless to have your seducer punished in any way at all, let alone by a God, or a Church, that to the absurd man has no validity whatever. I am not interested in the libertine's actions at the moment; I assume that he will seduce by any technique or stratagem he can invent for his purpose. I am interested only in your man's psychology, his inner urges. So I accept your *Burlador* play in all its main elements but two: its ending, and the use of its refrain, "*tan largo me lo fiáis*." These I shall recast and reinterpret. Thereby I shall change your play profoundly, and it will become an absurd play. No longer will it try to teach an invalid moral and theological lesson, but it will offer a lesson in human psychology that makes sense in our twentieth century."

Some between-the-lines prologue like this is surely to be read in Camus' book. To implement it he has made the promised recasting of the *Burlador's* ending (*Sisyphé*, page 105). In it, he does not permit the Comendador to kill Don Juan, but takes him to a monastery to die peacefully. This, thinks Camus, "offers the logical ending for a life completely penetrated by the absurd, the grim ending of an existence turned toward joys with no tomorrow." Camus continues: "I see Don Juan in a cell of

one of those Spanish monasteries lost on a hill. And if he contemplates anything, it is not the ghost of past loves, but perhaps, through a sun-bathed slit some silent Spanish plain, a noble and *soulless* land in which he recognizes himself. [My italics.] Yes, it is on this melancholy and radiant image that one must pause. The ultimate end, awaited but never desired, the ultimate end is unworthy of our concern."

There is no need to stress again that in refashioning the denouement of the *Burlador* Camus did only what was necessary to make the character of his libertine congruent with his own philosophy. It is apparent that Tirso's ending is quite impossible for him. For Tirso causes him to be punished by a (to Camus) non-existent God, to lose a non-existent Heaven, to be hurled into a non-existent Hell. Camus can see the need for Don Juan's punishment only if churchmen are permitted to decide his fate, for the great libertine (*Sisyphé*, page 103) "attains a knowledge without illusions which negates all that they profess."

As for Camus' interpretation of Tirso's "*tan largo me lo fáiis*," this thematic and powerfully dramatic expression of Don Juan's refusal to give thought to the day of reckoning becomes a statement of the libertine's complete lack of belief in any day of reckoning at all. In Tirso, the *burlador*, full of the immense vigor of youth and unable therefore to conceive of death for himself in some far distant day (an entirely normal reaction in a healthy youth), puts aside the bothersome reminders of his father, of his servant and others that God is preparing punishment for him unless he repents. He is a believer;⁸ he knows that he must repent some time, but tomorrow always seems a more suitable day. In Camus the refrain is rendered in free translation as "But death is a long way off" ("*Que tu me donnes un long délai*"), and it is followed by Camus' own exclamation

8. Tirso's Don Juan is indeed a believer, as is shown by his vain plea to Don Gonzalo for time for repentance and confession at the end of the play. Whereas Camus' libertine has a sort of satanic majesty that may arouse admiration in hearts attuned to rebellion, Tirso's creature is a conformist who at no time has any intention of a definitive revolt against Heaven. Tirso was, I feel, incapable of producing a truly satanic figure, largely because of his temperament, but also partly because of churchly censorship over his plays. Like Tirso's Don Juan, Paulo of the *Condenado por desconfiado* (probably Tirso's play) was not a true rebel, not at all a satanic figure, for he saw the terrible error of his ways before perdition fell upon him.

that to Don Juan "What comes after death is futile, and what a long succession of days for one who knows how to be alive!" (*Sisyphé*, page 99)

In our contrasting of Tirso's *burlador* and Camus' libertine, two things are immediately obvious: 1) that this brief paper is no more than an introduction to a very large subject, and 2) that even so it is apparent from what has appeared above that the two writers are as far apart as they well could be in the interpretation of the great lover. To Tirso, the orthodox Spanish priest, the Christian moralist, the lesson of the *Burlador* is that the wages of sin is death. To Camus, the French existentialist-atheist stimulus of a large portion of Western thought in our time, the lesson is that one may do as one pleases, with the assurance of no guilt complex, of no punishment through remorse if one can achieve to the full the absurd man's protective philosophy. There is, in passing, no reason to suspect that Tirso ever permitted himself the severe agonizings of a Camus; but if he ever had them, they were crushed ruthlessly within his own heart, perhaps to have an occasional outlet in small ways in the tensions of his plays. One may suspect that Tirso may have deplored within himself his lack of an answer to the problem of evil in the human heart (a problem that Camus refused to acknowledge as existent), for it seems to us that Tirso's agile mind could hardly have been completely satisfied by the stock religious answers he learned as a student of the priesthood. He could not explain to himself the really fundamental essence of his Don Juan, but then neither can Camus. Whatever may have been Tirso's wonderings about the nature and the ultimate destiny of man, there is no record of them in his plays, except as he employed the orthodox religious answers of his time. Like his fellow-writers of the Golden Age, Tirso chose to interest himself in moral rather than in metaphysical problems; his Church had already solved the metaphysical puzzles for him. Tirso accepted as unquestionable the principle of Western Christianity that man's being is rooted in God; to him, Camus' philosophy of a completely man-centered world would have been a horrible blasphemy. One thing does seem certain: that whether Tirso was or was not "mistaken" in his philosophy of life, he

felt a serenity of spirit that has eluded man since the Age of Enlightenment, and especially during the last fifty years.⁹

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

9. Leo Weinstein (*The Metamorphoses of Don Juan*, Stanford, 1959, pp. 158-61) gives some attention to Camus' absurd Don Juan. His treatment, brief of necessity, obviously was intended only to open the subject for further discussion.

WILLA CATHER'S *THE PROFESSOR'S HOUSE* AND ANATOLE FRANCE'S *LE MANNEQUIN D'OSIER*

By WOLFGANG BERNARD FLEISCHMANN

LEON EDEL, in his recent work on literary biography, dwells at length on the symbolic values of the furnishings in Professor St. Peter's study in Willa Cather's *The Professor's House*. According to Professor Edel, a link in psychoanalytic terms can be established between Willa Cather's affection for her own converted sewing-room-work-room in the Pittsburgh residence of her friend Isabelle McClung and St. Peter's almost abnormal attachment to his study. Both rooms represent a sort of womb to which the author and her projected fictional hero can retire from the insecurities of adult life. The maternal atmosphere both of Willa Cather's study and of that which she describes in *The Professor's House* is enhanced by the presence of dressmakers' dummies. In the novel, the

two dummies express opposite experiences of the mother: one is described as matronly, of a bulk suggesting warm flesh and reassuring physical passion; the other is of sophisticated line suggesting spirit and sexual awareness and interest. So the professor has in his secluded place the beloved mother, who cares for and protects him but is also of some sexual interest to him. He wants his mother to be both a mother and an erotic stimulus and above all he wants to possess her exclusively.¹

Professor Edel also recalls to us that Miss Cather would return to her Pittsburgh study for "uninterrupted work" as often as her schedule as a busy New York editor would permit. These visits ended when Isabelle McClung, the study's owner, married—an event which created a crisis in Willa Cather's life and which immediately antedates the period of composition of *The Professor's House*.²

Without wishing to challenge Professor Edel's thesis I feel that his and our attention should be called to Willa Cather's conscious literary model for the study in her *Professor's House*: the work room of Monsieur Bergeret in Anatole France's novel *Le Mannequin d'Osier* (1897). In that work, the unhappily

1. Leon Edel, *Literary Biography* (Garden City, 1959), pp. 107-108

2. *Literary Biography*, pp. 116-117.

married Bergeret, a professor of Latin at a provincial French university, is forced by circumstance to use his wife's sewing-room as a study. This, like Professor St. Peter's room in Willa Cather's novel, has only one drafty window and is further cramped by the presence of Mme. Bergeret's wicker-work sewing form: "Il était là, debout, contre les éditions savantes de Catulle et de Pétrone, le mannequin d'osier, image conjugale."³ For Anatole France, the mannequin is so much the controlling symbol of his professor's generally shabby situation that he elevates it to the title of his domestic drama in novel form.

That Willa Cather was aware of Anatole France's novel and of its use of a mannequin in the professor's study we know from the text of *The Professor's House*, a circumstance which might explain the absence of comment on the point by previous critics. Augusta, the St. Peter's sewing woman

somehow got it into her head that these forms were unsuitable companions for one engaged in scholarly pursuits, and she periodically apologized for their presence when she came to install herself and fulfill her "time" at the house. 'Not at all, Augusta,' the Professor had often said. 'If they were good enough for *Monsieur Bergeret*, they are certainly good enough for me.'⁴

It is curious to note that Willa Cather's professor remembers *two* sewing forms in Monsieur Bergeret's study rather than one—thus making his workroom seem in that respect identical with the one Anatole France describes. Willa Cather's *misremembering* the room in *Le Mannequin d'Osier* which she consciously uses as a literary source illustrates its assimilation to her creative process and may, for all we know, point back to unconscious aspects of the mannequin symbolism in *The Professor's House* so ably interpreted by Leon Edel.

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

3. Anatole France, *Le Mannequin d'Osier* (Paris, 1897), p. 3.

4. Willa Cather, *The Professor's House* (New York, 1925), p. 19.

NOTA SOBRE UN POEMA DE HERRERA Y REISSIG

By BERNARDO GICOVATE

EN LA CONFUSA CRONOLOGÍA de la obra de Julio Herrera y Reissig se han dado por demostradas unas pocas fechas que a menudo nos sirven de guía en el penoso esfuerzo de deslindar lo valioso de lo perecedero. Es desagradable por cierto descubrir a veces, e insistir en ello, que lo que se creía sabido era erróneo y tener que volver a empezar. Pero se podrá ganar siempre un poco de exactitud en las fechas mismas y quizá un poco más de certeza en la valoración.

Por ejemplo el tomo de *Poesías completas*, publicado en Buenos Aires en 1942—con segunda edición en 1945—, prologado por Guillermo de Torre y ordenado más o menos cronológicamente, da, al pie de un poema largo, *El laurel rosa*, el año 1908. El poema lleva dos subtítulos, *Apoteosis* y *Recepción* y está dedicado a Sully Prudhomme. Guillermo de Torre sigue aquí la cronología establecida por Juan Mas y Pi¹ y modificada por Y. Pino Saavedra.² Ambos coinciden al fechar este poema y seguramente han pensado en la fecha de la muerte de Sully Prudhomme—oportunidad del poema, puesto que se trata de la recepción de su alma en el Olimpo. Como el escritor francés había muerto el 7 de septiembre de 1907 y se trata de un romance largo de más de doscientos versos, habrá que admitir la fecha, mayormente si se tiene en cuenta un retraso posible de noticias e inspiración. Además es muy posible que el manuscrito mismo de Herrera feche el poema en 1908, lo que no obsta sin embargo, como veremos, para sostener que no se escribió en este año.

La fecha es errónea. Y, a pesar de lo que parecería a primera vista, el poema se escribió antes de 1908, probablemente antes de la muerte de Sully Prudhomme. Claro que Herrera no podía haber presentado su muerte y dedicado el poema al futuro. Lo curioso es que se había publicado ya el poema en 1907 en un

1. "Julio Herrera y Reissig," *Nosotros*, XIII (1914), 234-265.

2. *La poesía de Julio Herrera y Reissig. Sus temas y su estilo*. (Santiago de Chile, 1932).

libro poco conocido de Alberto Nin Frías.³ Esta publicación ha pasado inadvertida aunque hay además en el libro un fragmento de una carta de Herrera y Reissig, a quien llama Nin Frías "Shelley sudamericano."⁴ El poema aquí se titula *Recepción* y se encuentra entre los elogios del autor que se imprimen después de sus ensayos. Se trata ahora de la recepción de Nin Frías, vivo, por los dioses del Olimpo.

Habrà que retrasar entonces la fecha de composición del poema a 1907 al menos y decidir que el año 1908 marca solamente la fecha de una dedicatoria nueva y de los cambios necesarios en el texto. Pero no es esto todo. Si se comparan las dos versiones del poema, se podrá además aprender algo acerca de la manera de escribir del poeta y del valor del poema. La versión primera, dedicada a Alberto Nin Frías, consta de 96 versos, mientras que la que se conoce generalmente tiene 226, lo que ya indica una gran diferencia y reivindica hasta cierto punto la fecha posterior como la fecha de revisión. Si así se reivindica un poco al poeta mismo, por lo contrario el valor de este poema parece desaparecer ante la impresión general de la lectura de las dos versiones. Nos parece que nos encontramos frente a una adulación lista para encajarse a las circunstancias y el añadir versos aquí y allá en ristas sin mayor sentido no agrega gran cosa al poema. La mistificación, casi diríamos superchería, aparece entera en versos bien pobres que nombran al recipiente de una y otra versión:

Alberto Nin, tú has pasado
por el Citerón; mil voces
te han acogido; tú has hecho
temblar los antiguos robles.

* * *

Sully Prudhomme, tú has ido
hacia el Citerón; mil voces
te objetivaron; tú has hecho
temblar los antiguos robles.

Aun el casi hallazgo de "te objetivaron"—una novedad tan usada en la obra de Herrera que nos suena a clisé aquí—de apariencia intelectual, sorprende ahora como un cambio artificial y se empieza, o se termina, por dudar del valor poético de esta seudofilosofía ingrata. Sería inútil continuar y dar detalles

3. *Nuevos ensayos de crítica* (Montevideo: Imprenta de Dornaleche y Reyes, 1907).

4. *Ibid.*, p. 233.

de todos los versos añadidos, que insisten en un afán de adornar el poema de exotismos de vocabulario. La flaqueza momentánea del ingenio de Herrera se ve claramente en estos versos endeble de la segunda versión que parecen imitación de sí mismo:

abriéronse cien mil ojos
 en el Infinito miope;
 redobló Pegaso el trueno
 bajo sus cascos indóciles;
 sonó su antífona el Pindo:
 "¡Gloria plena tibi, domine!";
 fulguraron zodiacales
 signos: ¡A Sully Prudhomme!

Para terminar, resumamos que Herrera al parecer arreglaba sus poemas de circunstancias para satisfacer necesidades de momento y lo que había sido "Renán y el divino Hipólito—sublimizaron tu nombre," podía convertirse sin mayor sonrojo en "y Homero y Hugo y Verlaine—sublimizaron tu nombre." Por esta razón habrá que vigilar constantemente la opinión acerca de su poesía y no confundir lo deleznable circunstancial con los momentos de extraordinaria luminosidad cuando "la tarde paga en oro divino la faena" y "las cumbres, ya quiméricas corónanse de rosas." El poema *El laurel rosa* o *Recepción*, en sus dos versiones, pertenecerá entonces a la parte deleznable de una obra de altibajos y debe fecharse en 1907 para la versión primitiva.

TULANE UNIVERSITY

EUCCHARISTIC SYMBOLS IN THE POETRY OF JULIO HERRERA Y REISSIG

By RAYMOND SOUZA

JULIO HERRERA Y REISSIG is known as a symbolist, and various influences have been studied in attempting to ascertain the meanings and significances of certain symbols in his works. One of the most striking symbolistic techniques used by Herrera y Reissig, as shown by Gicovate in his analysis of Herrera y Reissig's symbolistic methods, is synesthesia, the creation of one sensory impression by the use of others.¹ Herrera y Reissig's use of synesthesia is related to, if not the same thing as, his use of religious terminology, which is encountered in his search for good and evil and his understanding of love. It should be pointed out that he uses religious symbols in the expression of profane love, but this usage is more than casual because of the depth of his Catholic heritage.

The sacrament of the Holy Eucharist is essentially an act of sacrifice. It reenacts the sacrifice of Christ to God for the sake of man and in the ritual of the mass the body and blood of Christ are represented by bread and wine, and in fact, they are actually taken to be the body and blood of Christ in the Catholic Mass. The bread itself consists of a round wafer and is called the Host. It is difficult to explain fully the importance given to this sacrament and ritual by the Catholic mind. To state that the Holy Eucharist is the central rite of Catholicism, that the bread and wine are taken to be the actual body and blood of Christ, and that the priest is the only one allowed to touch the chalice which contains the wine and bread, will perhaps convey some of the importance given to this sacrament.

One more consideration of importance here in relation to the significance of the Holy Eucharist is the idea of a unifying process that underlies this sacrament. Individuals, by partaking of the body of Christ, in the ritual of the mass unite themselves with one another, with Christ, and finally, and most importantly,

1. Bernard Gicovate, *Julio Herrera y Reissig and the Symbolists* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1957).

with God. We shall see this particular significance used by Herrera in his poetry.

I shall deal with three aspects of Herrera's use of religious symbols and words relating to the Holy Eucharist: (1) his use of such words as "eucaristía" and "hostia" for a descriptive setting or meaning, (2) his concern with and use of the idea of sacrifice as related to the mass, and (3) his use of the underlying idea of the unifying process involved in the partaking of the body and blood of Christ. It should be noted that Herrera does not use these references to create symbols which are themselves religious; rather, he uses the established association of the religious reference in the creation of a symbol which may have nothing to do with religion but which will evoke the reaction required by the poem.

In the sonnet *Reina del Arpa y Amor* we see his use of terms referring to the Holy Eucharist to develop a descriptive setting and to convey the idea of the unifying act.

Duermen tus manos de prerrafaelísticas
insinuaciones todos mis vaivenes;
manos que son custodias eucarísticas
para las regias hostias de tus sienes.²

His "vaivenes", a word which implies a back and forth motion and wavering, otherwise emotional turmoil, are contained in the "manos" that are described as "custodias eucarísticas". And in these hands that are like eucharistic monstrances his "vaivenes" "duermen". Furthermore, in the last line he refers to the "regal hosts of your temples", an expression that implies purity of the highest order. Therefore, Herrera relates three images to each other: her purity, her eucharistic hands, and his "vaivenes". The emotional reactions are ones of awe and wonderment in the face of purity and, more important, one of peace. Just as the sacrament of Holy Eucharist gives peace and serenity to the participants in the sacrifice of the mass, so does she to him.

As to the act of unification as related to the Holy Eucharist, we have the following lines from the same sonnet:

¡Vamos a Dios! Entre floridos cánticos,

2. Julio Herrera y Reissig, *Poesías Completas*, Edición de Guillermo de Torre (Buenos Aires: Editorial Losada, S.A., 1958), p. 270.

piquen tus dedos, pájaros románticos,
el Arpa antigua del vergel Sión . . .

Y alzando a ti mi beso, en un hipnótico
rpto de azul, como en un cáliz gótico
beberé el vino de tu corazón.³

The association of the words "cáliz" and "vino" is clear here. Importance should also be placed on "alzando a ti mi beso", for it recalls the part of the mass called the Elevation when the priest raises the chalice above his head and looks up at it. From the "¡Vamos a Dios!" to the "alzando a ti mi beso" and finally the "beberé el vino de tu corazón", a beautiful succession is made in the poem as it is in the mass, concluding with the unifying act.

Use of eucharistic religious terms and symbols for descriptive purposes may also be seen in:

¡Híncate! Voy a celebrar la misa⁴
Bajo la azul genuflexión de Urano
Adoraré cual hostia tu camisa:

The command to kneel sets the scene and the comparison of adoring "tu camisa" like "hostia" completes the symbolic succession. In the next quotation a simple description of "dos palomas" that are like "hostias del cielo" is made:

. . . y en el níveo companario, que es un témpano sonoro, hay dos palomas muy blancas que son como hostias del cielo.⁵

In another case of the use of eucharistic symbols with the stress on the significance of the unifying act, there is an unusual twist, a strange reversal of the process. It is the poet who sees himself being sacrificed in order to be united with the source of his desire. He asks that she make of his "trigos" hosts for her altar.

¡Oh Sirena melódica en que el Amor conspira,
encarnación sonámbula de una aurora lunar!
Toma de mis corderos blancos para tu pira
y haz de mis trigos blancos hostias para tu altar.⁶

The third aspect of Herrera's use of eucharistic symbols, his interest in the sacrifice itself, contains an element of conscience which is in keeping with the Christian sense of guilt as related

3. Ibid.

4. *Neurastenia*, *ibid.*, p. 100.

5. *Névoso*, *ibid.*, p. 109.

6. *¡Eres Todo!*, *ibid.*, p. 213.

to the sacrifice. The mass reenacts Christ's sacrifice, namely the crucifixion, which He did for "our sins".

¡y te sacrificué, como un cordero,
mi pobre corazón, bajo los astros!⁷

The fact that he sacrificed her as he would a sheep, a defenseless animal, and his use of the expression "pobre corazón" seem to imply guilt. In the following quotation the sense of guilt and association with the sacrifice is made clear by the expressions "nos citó a juicio la honda conciencia", and "bebimos el horror del sacrificio, agonía a agonía y sorbo a sorbo".

Ante la tumba, que el destino torvo
abriera por tu amor, nos citó a juicio
la honda conciencia, y fué nuestro suplicio
como un vampiro de implacable morbo . . .

Bajo el influjo del menguante corvo,
que acuchillaba un grave maleficio,
bebimos el horror del sacrificio,
agonía a agonía y sorbo a sorbo.⁸

Although Herrera used eucharistic symbols in most of his poetry, the most frequent examples of this technique are found in *Los Maitines de la Noche* and *Los Parques Abandonados*. It is interesting to relate Herrera's use of eucharistic symbols with his awareness of the problem of good and evil in the above mentioned works and in *Los Extasis de la Montaña*. The fact that Herrera found himself involved in the problem of good and evil, the environmental significance of the Eucharist, and his association of the two, lead one to believe that the eucharistic symbols are among the most profound expressions of the poet's self.

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

7. *Holocausto*, *ibid.*, p. 215.

8. *La Culpa*, *ibid.*, pp. 218-219.

BENAVENTE AND SHAKESPEARIAN DRAMA

By KESSEL SCHWARTZ

BENAVENTE'S LECTURES AND essays contain many constantly recurring ideas about various facets of Shakespearian drama, though his findings often appear somewhat contradictory.

In raising the question as to whether Shakespeare should be read or performed, he quotes Charles Lamb's well-known statement that the figure of Lear is of too gigantic proportions to be represented on the stage. Indeed many admirers of Shakespeare, even in England, feel that *King Lear*, *The Tempest* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream* lose much of their greatness and beauty by being performed (*Obras completas*, IX, 751).¹ Benavente agrees that even with the most modern theatrical techniques, it would be impossible to present with absolute reality Shakespearian battle fields or supernatural creations (VI, 615). Yet, says Benavente, even though in certain plays like *The Tempest* it is difficult to portray what must exist only in one's imagination, Shakespeare's works were meant to be performed.

The Spanish authors of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries accepted the fact that they wrote for a public, national and popular, and none really elevated himself over the nation and the times. "Shakespeare, por eso, es el más grande autor dramático; entre los horrores, brutalidades, groserías y bufonadas de su teatro (idéntico en asuntos, forma y procedimientos al de todos los autores de su época), deja libre vagar a su espíritu de poeta, ideal Ariel, que a su vuelo todo lo concierta y todo lo esclarece, como espíritu superior a su tiempo y a su obra misma" (VI, 599).

Benavente wonders whether one reads in Shakespeare the author and actor's works, composed of bits and pieces of previous works intended to please the London masses who attended the Globe Theatre, "aquel teatro en donde se apreciaba el número de espectadores por el olor más o menos fuerte a la ginebra, que se quemaba para disipar el producido por una gran cubeta, en donde los espectadores vertían sin miramiento, lo que Molière

1. All citations from Benavente in my text are to the *Obras completas*, 11 vols. (Madrid: Aguilar, 1950-58).

llamó 'lo superfluo de la bebida' " (VII, 55). Benavente assumes that we read in Shakespeare the great overlay of critical works on him which have helped create his powerful image, but he insists that from time to time it is necessary to bathe oneself in sincerity and confront one's judgment, satiated by such literature, with the spontaneous sentiment of a virgin spirit. Only before a popular audience can Shakespearian theatre truly be given, for the popular audience makes up with its perceptiveness what it may lack in intelligence.

For the Shakespearian lovers, among whom he includes himself, "a los que llevamos en el corazón y sobre nuestra cabeza el nombre de Shakespeare, es difícil que una representación de cualquier obra suya pueda satisfacernos nunca" (IX, 751). However, certain precepts will make the play more palatable. Since the impact on an audience, for Benavente, should be primarily an emotional one, the actors should not try to read too much into the roles, but should act them simply as the plays were written. Shakespearian characters, he contends, are of a simple psychology. "Pero ¿hay nada más sencillo que la psicología de Oteló? ¿Nada más infantil que su credulidad ante las burdas maquinaciones de Yago? ¿Hay nada más infantil que la conducta de Yago? Un malvado que nos avisa él mismo de que es un malvado. ¿Hay nada más infantil que Romeo y Julieta? Ni sería bien que fuera de otro modo. El mismo Hamlet, considerado como prototipo de la complejidad psicológica, ¿hay nada más ondulantemente rectilíneo, valga el contrasentido?" (VII, 815). The best Shakespearian actors follow the text, and those who receive the constant applause of the audience for their effects may have performed very well indeed, but they will not have been faithful to their role (*A B C*, April 24, 1949).

Benavente mentions the various actors he has seen and comments that they all tried to add to the dimensions of various scenes, either in a search for something new or because of the tradition of their national interpretations. The Italian actors sought inspiration from Modena y Salvini, the French from Talma, the English from Garrick and the Americans from Booth. Most of the actors lacked the lyric force to portray tragedy, but they did the comedies creditably. However, "si en la representación no parece el poeta sobre todo, puede decirse que la obra gana poco representada y es preferible su lectura" (IX, 702).

The Germans were the best critical interpreters of Shakespeare,

and the Italians the best actors, though he takes Garavaglia to task for his theatrical attempts. Benavente considered the greatest single Shakespearian actor to be Ernesto Rossi, even though he saw the latter at an advanced age when he was ill. In his interpretation of Lear and Hamlet, he was unmatched. "Fué el gran intérprete de Shakespeare; la representación de sus obras por Rossi era un curso explicativo que siempre descubría algo nuevo al más conocedor del teatro de Shakespeare" (VI, 658). Even in his performance of Romeo, in spite of his figure, more like that of Falstaff than of Romeo, if one closed one's eyes, one found his interpretation superb in spite of his physique. "Y es difícil que actor alguno pueda superarle en sentimiento y comprensión del apasionado amante veronés" (VI, 637). Benavente's two favorite women actors were Eleonora Duse and Sarah Bernhardt, both of whom he liked in the role of Cleopatra. He laments the fact that Eleonora Duse acted primarily in *Antony and Cleopatra*, but explains that in most of Shakespeare's plays the women had a comparatively inferior role, and it would have defrauded the public to have a star of her magnitude perform them (*A B C*, May 16, 1948).

In several essays Benavente discusses Hamlet's age. He must have been young, otherwise he would have been elected King on the death of his father. Furthermore, we know that he intends to return to the University of Wittenberg to study. Benavente insists that the first Hamlet was younger, but that Shakespeare's actor friend Burbage, an associate in the Globe Theatre and according to the testimony of his contemporaries an older and plump man, prevailed upon Shakespeare to create an older and stouter Hamlet. Today, of course, no one imagines a fat Hamlet. In some of his essays Benavente seems to prefer the age span of fifteen to eighteen years for Hamlet; in others, sixteen to twenty years of age.

Benavente commented on the anachronisms to be found in so many of Shakespeare's plays. For the most part, he feels that the human quality of the characters transcends their time and that Shakespeare offered his spectators through the ear what he well knew was impossible through the eye. He disagrees with Oscar Wilde, who insisted that Shakespearian tragedy demanded great historical and geographical fidelity. Speaking of a performance of *Antony and Cleopatra*, the latter interpreted by the professional beauty Miss Langtry, he points out that the produc-

tion paid the greatest attention to archeological details in clothes and accessories, but that in view of the anachronisms in Shakespeare, such care was excessive. In discussing the movie version of *Hamlet*, he criticizes Olivier, who, in his judgment, went to violent extremes both of repulsion and affection, especially in the third act where he tells Ophelia, "Get thee to a nunnery." Benavente criticizes, too, the lack of tragical decorum and the poor acting of Ophelia, but what bothers him most is the lack of accuracy in geographical background and dress. Here Benavente admits that though anachronisms are inevitable, they should be similar ones and not from different historical periods in the same play.

In view of Benavente's obvious admiration for Shakespeare, one wonders how the latter fares in a comparison with Spanish writers. Benavente deems his countrymen superior. He says: "Nadie duda de mi admiración, conocido es mi culto por sus obras: pero al compararlo con nuestros autores dramáticos del Siglo de Oro: Lope de Vega, Calderón, Tirso y otros también, bien sé que pudiera enfrentárselos a Shakespeare y decirlo, como los nobles de Aragón ante su rey: 'Nos, que cada uno somos tanto como vos, y todos juntos más que vos'" (XI, 424). He insists that in the Spanish theatre, the vigor and tragic breadth equals that of Shakespeare, and that the comedies are superior to those of Shakespeare in force, richness of invention and elegance. "Nuestros autores del Siglo de Oro pueden muy bien enfrentarse con Shakespeare" (XI, 608). He claims throughout that Lope de Vega is superior to Shakespeare: "Para mí, Lope de Vega es superior a Shakespeare" (XI, 471). "Yo por mi parte, a nuestro Lope de Vega lo considero muy superior a Shakespeare" (XI, 608). "¿No nos atreveremos, por fin, a decir que es superior a Shakespeare, y que cualquier nación que contara con Lope de Vega no sabría donde colocarlo?" (IX, 1031). In comparing the themes of *Hamlet* and *La vida es sueño*, he feels that "por la concepción y el desempeño del asunto, es Calderón el que más puede presumir de originalidad" (XI, 174). Benavente considers Calderón's masterpiece, in concept and thought, "muy superior a todas las de Shakespeare." (XI, 608).

Benavente has written on almost every aspect of Shakespeare, has translated two of his plays and a soliloquy, has adapted part or all of six Shakespearian works in his own plays, and has written some poetry on Shakespeare. Benavente refers constantly

to Shakespeare's characters. He quotes incessantly in every volume of his *Obras completas* his favorite Shakespearian lines, among which are: "The rest is silence," "Tis meat and drink to me to see a clown," "There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio, than are dreamt of in your philosophy."

In summing up Benavente's findings, we might do well to use his own statement: "Todos los críticos detractores de Shakespeare, desde Voltaire y Moratín con el conde Tolstoi y Bernard Shaw y el autor francés . . . — no recuerdo su nombre. ¿Lo ven ustedes? No recuerdo su nombre—que escribió un libro titulado *La superstición shakespiriana*, todos tienen razón. Contra lo razonable no hay objeción posible; pero ninguna de sus críticas razonables ha podido restar un solo creyente a Shakespeare; porque, como decía el misántropo de Molière: *Cela mène, la raison me le dit chaque jour, mais la raison n'est pas ce qui règle l'amour*" (XI, 716).

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS

PAUL VERLAINE AND DIOSCORIDES ON POETRY AND THE SCENT OF THYME

By ALFRED G. ENGSTROM

ANYONE INTERESTED in the controversial subject of *poésie pure* is likely to be familiar with Verlaine's famous "Art poétique,"¹ which champions the ideal of a vague, musical poetry of hovering meanings and delicate nuances. Verlaine calls for an end of eloquence in poetry ["Prends l'éloquence et tords-lui son cou!"] and urges avoidance of sharp jest, cruel wit, and low comedy:

Fuis du plus loin la Pointe assassine,
L'Esprit cruel et le Rire impur,
Qui font pleurer les yeux de l'Azur,
Et tout cet ail de basse cuisine!²

The last four lines of the poem distinguish in terms of mint and thyme on the morning wind between poetry and mere "literature":

Que ton vers soit la bonne aventure
Epars au vent crispé du matin
Qui va fleurant la menthe et le thym . . .
Et tout le reste est littérature.

It is significant that Verlaine employs olfactory imagery in his attempt to describe the quintessence of poetry; for, from the time of Baudelaire, the sense of smell had come to play an increasingly important role in French letters.³ Here Verlaine clearly associates the fragrance of mint and thyme "on the 'crisp' morning wind" with the ultimate poetic ideal (*l'Azur*).

In the second century B.C. the smell of thyme was equated with a very different kind of literature in a sepulchral epigram attributed in the Palatine Anthology to Dioscorides and said to

1. *Oeuvres complètes de Paul Verlaine*, I (Paris: Albert Messein, 1911), 313-314.

2. Verlaine's image of the Azure of the Ideal with her eyes weeping from the vulgar kitchen garlic of undesirable jest, wit, and laughter, seems itself an amusing example of what to avoid in the imagery of pure poetry.

3. Even Brunetière called it "[le] plus suggestif peut-être . . . de tous nos sens," though he quickly added that it is also "le plus 'animal'" (*Nouveaux essais sur la littérature contemporaine* [Paris: Calmann-Lévy, s.d.], p. 137).

have been engraved at Alexandria on the tomb of Macho, a poet of the New Comedy.⁴

Sois légère, ô poussière, au poète comique Machon, et fais pousser en son honneur le lierre ami des concours, qui vit sur les tombes; car tu n'enfermes pas un frelon plagiaire, mais ce sont des restes dignes de l'art ancien que tu recouvres. Voici ce que le vieillard [i.e., Machon] dira: "O ville de Cécrops, même aux bords du Nil il est un terrain où vient pour les Muses un thym acre."⁵ This *pungent thyme for the Muses* [ὄθεν Μούσαις δριμύ . . . θύμον] is taken as a symbol for the rather gross humor of Athenian comedy, and the pertinence of the phrase is enlivened by a reference in Aristotle's *Problemata* [925^a8] to the bitter taste of Attic thyme.⁶ A mixture of thyme with honey and vinegar called θύμον was a characteristic dish of the poor in Attica.⁷ Aristophanes cites eating this mixture as a symbol of frugality [*Plutus*, 253];⁸ and in *The Runaways* [Δραπεταί, 14] Lucian mentions τάρικος [salt fish] and θύμον as typical fare of the lowly.⁹ Perhaps the most vivid reference of this sort occurs in an amusing *caractère* of Theophrastus (c. 371-c. 287 B.C.) on boorishness:

La rusticité est, semble-t-il, une grossièreté qui ignore les bienséances. Et voici quelle sorte d'homme est le rustre. Avant d'aller à l'assemblée, il absorbe son *kykéon*, et . . . soutient qu'il n'y a pas de parfum qui vaille le pouliot [καὶ . . . τὸ μύρον φάσκειν οὐδὲν τοῦ θύμου ἥδιον ὄζειν]. Il porte des souliers trop larges pour son pied. Il a le verbe haut. . . Dans l'établissement de bains, il chante. Il garnit de clous ses souliers.¹⁰

Here the *kykéon* [κυκεῶνα] was apparently a "mixture" of wine, flour, honey and θύμον ['wild mint']; and it has been suggested that in the supposed lacuna before τὸ μύρον someone has probably

4. Macho flourished in the second half of the third century B. C.

5. *Anthologie grecque: Première partie: Anthologie Palatine*, V (Collection . . . Guillaume Budé; Paris: "Les Belles Lettres," 1941), 153-154 (Livre VII, Epigramme 708). The last sentence in the original is as follows:

«Κέκροπος πόλι, καὶ παρὰ Νείλω
ἔστιν ὄθεν Μούσαις δριμύ πέφυκε θύμον.»

6. *Ibid.*, p. 154, footnote 2.

7. Liddell and Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (new ed., revised and augmented; Oxford: Clarendon Press), I, 810 (θύμον, τό, 2).

8. Aristophane, t. V: *L'assemblée des femmes*, *Plutus* (Collection . . . Guillaume Budé; Paris: "Les Belles Lettres," 1954), p. 100, note 5.

9. Lucian (Loeb Classical Library ed., 8 vols., 1936), V, 71.

10. Théophraste, *Caractères* (Collection . . . Guillaume Budé; 2e éd., Paris: "Les Belles Lettres," 1952), pp. 47-48 ("Le rustre" [Ἀγροικίας]).

complained about the odor of wild mint or *thyme* on the bumpkin's breath.¹¹

Thus for Verlaine in the late nineteenth century the scent of mint and thyme on the morning wind is a lovely olfactory image for *poésie pure*. But twenty centuries earlier the smell of thyme or wild mint is cited by Dioscorides in reference to the pungency of comic poetry, in a metaphor belonging to cookery—precisely what Verlaine calls “cet ail de basse cuisine” that makes the eyes of the Azure weep.

James Joyce has written, in a brilliant multiple pun, of “Thyme, that chef of seasoners.”¹² The phrase seems pertinent here to the remarkable *tang* of two completely different critical metaphors on the smell of thyme, and to the variety of sensibility evident in them with the seasonings of two thousand years.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

11. *Ibid.*, p. 47, footnote 1.

12. *Finnegans Wake* (New York: The Viking Press, 1945), p. 236.

MAUPASSANT'S *BEL-AMI* AND BALZAC

By MILTON CHAIKIN

FORTY YEARS AGO Olin H. Moore wrote: "*Bel-Ami* has been recognized as a modernized *Lucien de Rubempré*."¹ If one follows this clue, he will discover that Maupassant, in writing his second novel, appears to have been surprisingly dependent on Balzac's *Illusions perdues* (particularly the second part, *Un Grande Homme de province à Paris*) and to a lesser extent its sequel, *Splendeurs et misères des courtisanes*. The venal newspaper background in *Bel-Ami*, the rise in this milieu and in the milieu of grand society of the young man from the provinces, his rise at the expense of a number of women—and numerous details and situations—seem to have been borrowed from these earlier novels.

It is true that the milieu of journalism in *Bel-Ami* is less prominent than it is in *Illusions perdues*, where perfidies and chicaneries of newspapermen are enormous and are presented in great detail. But the corruption of the profession, and the meanness of its practitioners, the unscrupulous attacks upon personalities, and the insincerity of editorial policy in *Bel-Ami* seem to be adaptations of motifs in *Illusions perdues*. Once, after a rascally editor with Balzacian traits is depicted, an onlooker says, "Hein, est-il à la Balzac, celui-là?"²

Maupassant reduced the background and magnified the doubtful love-life of the protagonist in the story. But in many ways, important and unimportant, Georges Duroy, the protagonist of *Bel-Ami*, resembles Lucien de Rubempré, the hero of *Illusions perdues*. Both suffer poverty at the beginning of their careers in Paris, envy and cry out against the rich and privileged,³ and dream of making the leap to fortune, recognition, and luxury.⁴

Both gain entrée to journalism through a friend, are invited

1. "Literary Relationships of Guy de Maupassant," *Modern Philology*, XV (March, 1918), 647.

2. *Bel-Ami* (Paris, 1934), p. 64.

3. *Illusions perdues* (Paris, 1913), pp. 41, 20-21; *Bel-Ami*, pp. 37, 6-7, 102.

4. *I.P.*, 41, 43, 48; *B.-A.*, 41, 73.

to a supper where they meet an editor (*I.P.*, 170-89; *B.-A.*, 21-35), write a successful first article, rise quickly (*I.P.*, 264, 270; *B.-A.*, 148), and gain access to high society. Each fights a duel (*I.P.*, 346-49; *B.-A.*, 151-71). Both engage in corrupt practice, become wealthy by dubious means, and adopt aristocratic names (*I.P.*, 35; *B.-A.*, 205-6). Seeing themselves rich, well-loved, and powerful, they are extremely happy over their success (*I.P.*, 264-65; *B.-A.*, 393-95).

The contention that Georges Duroy was patterned upon Lucien de Rubempré is strongly confirmed by the fact that both are equally irresistible to many members of the opposite sex. First Coralie, and then Esther in *Splendeurs et misères des courtisanes*, fall passionately in love with Lucien. Mme Walter's passion for Georges has something of the same intensity, and Mme de Marelle's love for him is said to be "true, constant, profound" (p. 254). Lucien and Georges experience great joy in being the object of such feeling (*I.P.*, 169, 242; *B.-A.*, 34, 254).

Furthermore, both young men depend upon women for financial support and use them as stepping-stones in the realization of their ambitions. Coralie and Esther go to extremes to finance Lucien's aspiration: Coralie lavishes her money as well as her love upon him, and Esther goes so far as to become the mistress of the rich banker Nucingen for his sake. In *Bel-Ami*, Mme de Marelle pays the rent for their trysting place, Mme Walter insists on investing money in Georges' behalf, and Georges himself succeeds in winning away half the legacy left to his wife by Vaudrec. Finally, both Lucien and Georges lay plans to court rich and socially successful girls while they are having affairs with other women. Unlike Lucien, however, Georges succeeds.

Then there is one minor but telling similarity. Coralie puts money into Lucien's pocket after he has lost all at cards; he finds the money the next morning, is ashamed, intends to return it, and in the end accepts more. This situation is duplicated in *Bel-Ami*, except for the loss at cards, with Mme de Marelle as the benefactor (*I.P.*, 199; *B.-A.*, 107-9).

The Balzacian vestiges and echoes are sometimes faint, sometimes striking. They are found throughout *Bel-Ami*, but mostly at the beginning, where they are pronounced. For example, when Lucien and Georges are new in Paris, they are preoccupied with their lack of money. Both constantly count their francs and

sous, which they spend for meals and clothes.⁵ Both are anguished over their ill-cut garments on several occasions, in contrast with the elegance they see about them:

Après s'être convaincu, en voyant les hommes qui vaguaient dans le foyer, que sa mise était assez ridicule, Lucien vint se replacer au coin de sa loge . . . (*I.P.*, 37).

A l'aspect d'un homme dont l'élégance empruntée le faisait ressembler à un premier garçon de noces . . . (*I.P.*, 22-23)

La porte s'ouvrit presque aussitôt, et il se trouva en présence d'un valet en habit noir, grave rasé, si parfait de tenue que Duroy se troubla de nouveau sans comprendre d'où lui venait cette vague émotion: d'une inconsciente comparaison peut-être, entre la coupe de leurs vêtements. (*B.-A.*, 23)⁶

When Lucien accompanies Lousteau and Georges accompanies Forestier to the theater, entrée in each instance is gratis, as the newspapermen walk in importantly and the officials bow (*I.P.*, 144; *B.-A.*, 14). At the theater, Lucien is found enchanting by Coralie, who initiates a relationship, and Georges attracts Rachel, who makes advances to him (*I.P.*, 164; *B.-A.*, 18).

The fact that many details in *Bel-Ami* which have been cited do not seem necessary or well-integrated with the remainder of the novel is compelling support of the theory that they are borrowings. An example is Georges' writing letters to his parents in the country. In *Illusions perdues*, Lucien's writing home to his sister has a purpose and is important—for it calls attention to the contrast between the integrity of his origins and what he has become in Paris. Georges' letter-writing—and, indeed, all the episodes dealing with Georges' parents—appear to be irrelevant.

Illusions perdues and *Bel-Ami* are, of course, different in important ways. Balzac's theme is that a corrupt milieu will corrupt a weak nature, whereas Maupassant's theme is that in a corrupt milieu base mediocrity can and does triumph. The outlooks of the two writers were different, their literary methods were different, their styles were different—Balzac being abundant, fervid, romantic, moralistic, sentimental, and melodramatic; Maupassant being spare, detached, simple, pictorial, cynical, and pessimistic—and these differences obscure the resemblance. But Balzac was sufficiently critical of character and milieu to have enabled Maupassant to use his predecessor's fiction in

5. *I.P.*, 17, 22, 44, 47, 49, 55; *B.-A.*, 3-4, 5, 20, 59, 60, 65, 72, 78, 101-2, 103, 108.

6. See also *I.P.*, 18; *B.-A.*, 21.

launching his novel and to dip into it for motifs and suggestions.

Maupassant wrote feverishly; he had difficulty with the novel form; and he did not scruple to publish his pieces twice and to incorporate them into his novels. It is not surprising, therefore, that in this instance he should have leaned upon a writer he very much admired.

GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

NOTE SUR LA COLLABORATION DE THEOPHILE
GAUTIER AU MONDE DRAMATIQUE
DE NERVAL EN 1835

By PIERRE GUEDENET

QUAND NERVAL FONDA en 1835, pour la gloire de Jenny Colon, le *Monde Dramatique*, et se chercha des collaborateurs, nul n'était plus indiqué pour participer à la rédaction que Théophile Gautier, à qui le liait une amitié remontant à l'enfance et resserrée encore dans les récentes années, où les deux jeunes gens partagèrent le même appartement, rue du Doyenné, et fréquentèrent ensemble le Petit Cénacle.

L'actualité fournit à Gautier le sujet de plusieurs articles: une soirée théâtrale chez le duc de Castellane, la publication d'*Angelo* ou celle des *Scènes populaires* d'Henri Monnier. Pour ses autres articles, il tire parti des matériaux déjà réunis pour l'oeuvre littéraire qu'il a en chantier.

En 1835, c'est à consacrer par la publication d'un roman la réputation qu'il s'est faite depuis 1830 comme journaliste, poète et conteur, que Gautier travaille avec le plus d'énergie. Les pages qui paraissent en 1835 dans le *Monde Dramatique* sous le titre "De la comédie romanesque" formeront mot pour mot le début du chapitre XI de *Mademoiselle de Maupin* qui va paraître au début de 1836. Dans le roman, les réflexions sur la comédie romanesque font partie d'une longue lettre du héros, d'Albert, à son ami Sylvio, où il définit les affinités de son propre caractère avec l'âme poétique de la comédie shakespearienne, décrit ses discussions sur le théâtre avec les autres personnages du roman, Rosette et Théodore, et annonce le projet que, tous ensemble, ils viennent de faire jouer, comme divertissement de société, la comédie de Shakespeare, *Comme il vous plaira*. Ainsi les pages qui dans le *Monde Dramatique* se présentent comme de pure critique littéraire ont dans le livre un rôle à la fois psychologique et dramatique de premier plan, liant l'analyse de l'âme du héros en quête d'un amour idéal aux événements du chapitre suivant où, en regardant Théodore jouer le rôle de Rosalinde, il sent naître la certitude que Théodore est une femme et l'incarnation de son rêve.

De même, quand Gautier donne au *Monde Dramatique* quelques pages sur Scudéry, il les tire des recherches qu'il est alors en train de faire pour la série d'articles annoncés en janvier 1834 dans la *France littéraire* par une note de la rédaction comme "exhumations de . . . vieux poètes français, grotesques ou peu connus." L'article du *Monde Dramatique* réapparaît tout entier dans les *Grotesques*, publiés en 1843.

De plus, cette étude de la pièce de Scudéry, la *Comédie des Comédiens*, dans laquelle un troupe d'acteurs ambulants donne une représentation en province, a évidemment fourni à Gautier des matériaux utilisés dans la préparation du *Capitaine Fracasse*, publié en 1863 seulement, mais dont la préface de Gautier place le projet et les premiers efforts de rédaction à l'époque du *Monde Dramatique*. Les scènes mêmes sur lesquelles s'arrête le commentateur de 1835 dans le *Monde Dramatique* sont toutes reprises et développées avec complaisance dans le *Capitaine Fracasse*: l'invitation faite aux comédiens de donner une représentation; le tour de ville du tambourineur, annonçant la représentation; la fière réponse des acteurs à qui l'on demande le répertoire de la troupe et qui est, mot pour mot, la même dans le *Monde Dramatique* que dans le livre; la représentation d'une pastorale de Scudéry; la scène enfin qui est le point de départ des principaux épisodes du livre, celle où le baron de Sigognac arrête le geste insolemment galant du duc de Vallombreuse dans la loge de l'actrice Isabelle, et dont le germe est dans la phrase de Scudéry que Gautier cite dans le *Monde Dramatique*: "l'autre . . . tranchant de l'officieux voudra mettre une mouche sur la gorge, mais à dessein d'y toucher."¹

Ce ne sont pas seulement le cadre et les traits d'oeuvres déjà en chantier qui s'esquissent dans ces articles de Gautier dans le *Monde Dramatique*, mais aussi l'orientation même de ses aspirations artistiques dans les années à venir.

Ce n'est plus seulement au prosaïsme bourgeois que, comme tout Jeune-France, il décoche ses flèches, mais à la laideur de la réalité en elle-même. S'il a plaisir à commenter la caricature qu'Henri Monnier, un compagnon de la bataille d'*Hernani*, fait des types bourgeois contemporains, il se détourne avec surprise et gêne du réalisme de son oeuvre écrite: "J'avoue qu'il m'est impossible de comprendre la façon dont Henri Monnier

1. *Monde Dramatique*, I (1835), 69.

procède, et le point de vue où il se met. Ce qu'il fait n'est ni lyrique, ni dramatique, ni comique même. C'est la chose; rien de plus, rien de moins."²

De la même façon, dans l'article sur la comédie romanesque il exprime son aversion de la comédie qui peint la réalité, fût-ce pour corriger les mœurs: "Je ne suis pas d'avis que l'on double le nombre des sots en les représentant. . . . L'image d'un cuistre est aussi peu intéressante que ce cuistre lui-même, et pour être vu au miroir, ce n'en est pas moins un cuistre."³

Il y a dans ces passages du *Monde Dramatique* l'écho évident des idées que Gautier développe dans la longue préface, en préparation à ce même moment, de *Mademoiselle de Maupin*, où la raillerie à l'égard des mœurs littéraires imposées par la bourgeoisie laisse transparaître la conviction esthétique: "Il n'y a de vraiment beau que ce qui ne peut servir à rien; tout ce qui est utile est laid."⁴

En Victor Hugo, comme le montre l'article passionné sur *Angelo*, Gautier salue le maître qui lui a révélé le secret de l'envol poétique par lequel l'âme échappe à la laideur de la réalité. Accablant de son mépris le public insensible à la poésie, il se félicite qu'en dépit de cette incompréhension "l'aigle de M. Hugo donne . . . de grands coups d'aile."⁵

Toutefois, bien que Gautier dans son oeuvre poétique de 1830 à 1845 s'inspire si évidemment du lyrisme d'Hugo, c'est moins sur l'aspect lyrique du drame qu'il s'arrête dans son compte rendu du *Monde Dramatique* que sur ses qualités plastiques, avec une insistance qui révèle chez lui l'éveil de préoccupations esthétiques nouvelles.

C'est au point même que certaines réflexions semblent s'appliquer davantage à *Mademoiselle de Maupin*, que Gautier est en train de terminer, qu'au drame d'Hugo: "Les passions et les défauts de l'homme ne sont pas inépuisables, et ne peuvent donner lieu qu'à un certain nombre de combinaisons qui ont déjà été reproduites mille fois. Reste donc l'aventure, le roman, le caprice, la fantaisie curieuse du style."⁶

2. *Monde Dramatique*, I (1835), 32.

3. *Monde Dramatique*, II (1835), 100.

4. *Mademoiselle de Maupin*, nouvelle édition Charpentier (Paris 1886), p. 21.

5. *Monde Dramatique*, I (1835), 114.

6. *Monde Dramatique*, I, 114.

Le commentaire sur le style d'*Angelo*, qui occupe la plus grande partie de l'article est écrit comme s'il s'agissait de rendre compte d'une oeuvre plastique, du point de vue d'un peintre, d'un sculpteur ou d'un architecte, et évoque, pour suggérer les effets que le drame d'Hugo produit sur le spectateur, les peintures de Michel-Ange, les statues de Puget, et "la terreur ténébreuse" du Piranèse, "ce démon du cauchemar architectural."

Dans cet article sur Victor Hugo, Gautier rend explicite que l'emprunt à la langue des arts plastiques n'est pas seulement un procédé de style. Il définit consciemment ce qui est implicite aussi bien dans ses commentaires littéraires sur Hugo, Scudéry, Shakespeare que dans ses articles de critique d'art entre 1832 et 1835, sa croyance à la primauté de la forme parmi les vertus de l'oeuvre d'art, quelle qu'elle soit:

Ce fier génie . . . est un génie essentiellement plastique, amoureux et curieux de la forme, ainsi que tout véritable génie. La forme quoi qu'on ait dit est tout. Jamais on n'a pensé qu'une carrière de pierre fût artiste de génie. L'important est la façon qu'on donne à cette pierre, car autrement où serait la différence d'un bloc et d'une statue. Où serait la différence de Victor Ducange à Victor Hugo.— Le monde est la carrière, l'idée le bloc, et le poète, le sculpteur: sait-il son métier ou ne le sait-il pas, voilà la question.⁸

Il y a dans ces lignes de 1835, d'un ton si assuré, la profession de foi qui sert d' "art poétique" aux *Emaux et Camées*, parus en 1852, et qui s'exprime en particulier dans le célèbre poème *Art*, en des termes qui paraissent l'écho en vers de ce passage.

Ainsi l'intérêt des pages données au *Monde Dramatique* vient de ce qu'elles offrent un miroir de Gautier au moment où, cessant d'être seulement un disciple d'Hugo, il parvient à la maturité littéraire, et prend conscience de ses aspirations esthétiques les plus profondes aussi bien que des voies immédiates où il est en train d'engager sa carrière d'écrivain.

HUNTER COLLEGE, NEW YORK CITY

7. *Monde Dramatique*, I, 115.

8. *Monde Dramatique*, I, 114.

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY SPANISH REFUNDICIONES AS LITERATURE

By H. L. BALLEW

BEFORE* THE NINETEENTH century, the practise of making recasts, or *refundiciones* of the plays of the *siglo de oro* had fallen mainly into two categories. The first category, associated with the seventeenth century, resulted when one author borrowed a subject, or plot, from another author, and gave the subject a new treatment and new verses. There are many examples of this, a well-known one being Calderon's famous *El alcalde de Zalamea*, a reworking of a *comedia* by Lope de Vega. A second category emerged after 1750, when a few authors with little knowledge of the stage, and little talent, undertook the rewriting of *siglo de oro* plays with the idea of making them conform to neo-classical precepts. An uninspired example, typical of such efforts, is Sebastián y Latre's *refundición* of Moreto's *El parecido en la corte* (1775).¹

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, a third type of *refundición* began to emerge which was to have far-reaching influences. Traditionally Spanish themes which offered the audience a rallying point against French domination were in demand, and although the Golden Age *comedias* had been played frequently, the repertory was comparatively small. Some of Lope's neglected works were prepared in *refundiciones* by Trigueros, Castrellón, and Rodríguez de Arellano. Later, Dionisio Solís² followed with excellent *refundiciones* of *Marta la piadosa* (1819), *La villana de Vallecas* (1819), *Don Gil de las calzas verdes* (1820), and other plays of Tirso. Tirso, who had fallen into virtual oblivion, became the most popular *siglo de oro* dramatist

* A paper read at the Twelfth University of Kentucky Foreign Language Conference, Lexington, Kentucky, April 23-25, 1959.

1. I. L. McClelland, *The Origins of the Romantic Movement in Spain* (Liverpool, 1937), p. 171.

2. See Sterling A. Stoudemire, "Dionisio Solís's *Refundiciones* of Plays (1800-1834)," *HR*, VIII (1940), 305-10.

between the years 1820 and 1850 as a result of these *refundiciones*.³

Dionisio Villanueva y Ochoa, known in the theatre as Dionisio Solís, was a skilled adapter, translator of French and Italian works, a poet of considerable talent, and a dramatist. Although by training and inclination Solís favored the concepts of erudition and neo-classicism, the *comedia*, in his hands, was not sacrificed to rules. With Isidoro Máiquez in many of the leading roles, these *refundiciones* of *siglo de oro* authors were again exciting entertainment, and profitable business.

Once a repertory of *refundiciones* was available, the presentation of original, unretouched plays of the *siglo de oro* almost ceased. A division of the *comedia* into five acts became the usual practise, which meant that five different stage settings might be conveniently used, with stage redecorating done between acts. This feature permitted more extensive and elaborate stage sets. Music and musicians were generally dispensed with; minor characters were frequently omitted; long speeches were telescoped, and the text was cleared of conspicuous examples of *versos culteranos*. In the choice of subject matter, the *refundidores* favored the light comedies with amusing situations, and the *comedias de carácter*; religious subjects and the tragic aspects of the honor theme were avoided. Some attention was given to keeping one pair of lovers in focus, so that the hasty and indiscriminate pairing off at the end of the old *comedia* does not take place. Solís often amplifies the comic roles of the original. But he is capable of removing an indifferent *gracioso*. In *El valiente justiciero y el ricohombre de Alcalá*,⁴ many of the lines of Perejil are given to Mendo, a sober and dedicated companion of Don Tello, and Perejil does not appear in the play.

A great deal of this type of arranging was a scissors-and-paste operation, with a great proportion of the original lines being kept intact. Bits of original verse were used by the *refundidor* to provide motivation when locale was changed and to make

3. Statistics concerning performances of plays were compiled from the following sources: Nicholson B. Adams, "Siglo de Oro Plays in Madrid 1820-1850," *HR*, IV (1936), 342-57; Emilio Cotarelo y Mori, *Isidoro Máiquez y el teatro de su tiempo* (Madrid, 1902); Archibald K. Shields, "The Madrid Stage 1820-1833," unpubl. diss. (University of North Carolina, 1932).

4. Dionisio Solís, *El valiente justiciero y el ricohombre de Alcalá* (Madrid, 1848).

connection smooth where material from the original had been deleted. One must also take note of Solís's tendency to supply moral instruction. In *La villana de Vallecas*,⁵ for example, Solís is keenly aware of the transgressions of Tirso's character, Don Gabriel, who is obviously guilty of mendacity, impersonation, theft, seduction and desertion, and other assorted peccadillos. When Violante finally corners the erring lover, Solís has her deliver a sharp lecture on his conduct, after which the delinquent lover kneels and begs forgiveness. Aside from considerations whether these additions improve or detract from the play, they are certainly developments which would have astonished Tirso.

The work of *refundidores* was both praised and condemned. The frustration of the critics was probably deepened by the fact that comparison of the new version against the original was not easy, due to the scarcity of texts. Remarks from critics having to do with specific changes, therefore, are much less frequent than general grumpiness about the deplorable state of the theatre. In *A cada paso un acaso*,⁶ Larra refers to the authors of *refundiciones* as "arrimones literarios," and to their changes as "ridículas enmiendas," and "osadas mutilaciones."⁷ One critic refers to *Sancho Ortiz de las Roelas* as "una tragedia," complaining only that the corpse of Busto appears indecorously on the stage.⁸ Another notice about the same play advances the cautious opinion that the verses of the original had not been changed, and that the alterations made had been with the purpose of preventing changes of scenery between the acts. Another critic speaking of the same production inquires with obvious irritation whether or not these *refundiciones* constitute a "nuevo ramo de literatura inventado en España en el siglo pasado . . ."⁹

Taking due note of the disparagement implied, the critic raised a question for which we still have no ready answer. Can the *refundiciones* be considered a sort of derivative literature? If so, one of the problems is to determine where some *refundiciones* can be located.

5. Dionisio Solís, *La villana de Vallecas*, MS. Res-184, Biblioteca Municipal, Madrid.

6. Mariano José de Larra, *Artículos completos* (Madrid, 1944), p. 364.

7. Larra, p. 732.

8. Ada M. Coe, *Catálogo bibliográfico y crítico de las comedias anunciadas en los periódicos de Madrid, 1661-1819* (Baltimore, 1935), p. 200.

9. Coe, p. 201.

It is clear that Dionisio Solís was the most successful of all the authors who essayed this "nuevo ramo," bringing twenty works of the *siglo de oro* to the Spanish stage, accounting for as many as six hundred performances of those plays between 1810 and 1850.¹⁰ Of these twenty plays, only one was printed, and seven can be located in manuscript. His versions of *Marta la piadosa*, *García del Castañar*, and *El alcalde de Zalamea*, and others are probably lost, or are in the hands of private collectors. Of ten *refundiciones* credited to Bretón de los Herreros,¹¹ only three were published (including *Desde Toledo a Madrid*, on which he collaborated with Hartzenbusch). Hartzenbusch was also a dedicated *refundidor*. Of ten *refundiciones* credited to him,¹² five were printed, including *Desde Toledo a Madrid*, mentioned above; two manuscripts are available, three are probably lost. It would be difficult indeed to produce printed versions of twenty *refundiciones* of the early nineteenth century or locate manuscripts of twenty others known to have been performed.

Hartzenbusch, while preparing his edition of *Comedias escogidas*, remarked that the plays of Tirso were extremely rare, and that reliable manuscripts were scarcely to be found.¹³ The fact that satisfactory editions of the *siglo de oro* authors now exist is due, in large measure, to the work of the *refundidores* themselves. These performances of the *siglo de oro* plays, admittedly tailored to the prevailing taste, and not always in the spirit of the original, nevertheless served the purpose of having Spain admire again the lofty monuments of her national theatre, gave impetus to the neglected fields of criticism and scholarship, and even more important, suggested themes for the theatre of romanticism.

Although they may never have the authentic ring of the original, the best *refundiciones* will always be interesting, will in no way detract from the enjoyment of the *comedias* of the *siglo de oro*, and should be saved. Perhaps some editor of a text, then,

10. Cf. Adams, Cotarelo, Shields. Theatre records and newspaper reviews frequently neglected to say whether plays were *refundiciones*, but the number suggested probably errs on the side of conservatism.

11. Lewis E. Brett, *Nineteenth Century Spanish Plays* (New York, 1935), p. 167.

12. Brett, p. 121.

13. Tirso de Molina, *Comedias escogidas*, BAE, V, ed. Juan Eugenio Hartzenbusch (Madrid, 1924), p. x.

might well consider an edition of *La prudencia en la mujer*, by Tirso and Hartzenbusch; or *Con quien vengo, vengo*, by Calderón and Bretón; or perhaps *La villana de Vallecas*, by Tirso and Dionisio Solís. A text so prepared, with a number of baroque elements removed by a *refundidor* whose taste and ability are beyond question, would not be wanting in quality and interest. In addition, such publications would serve the very useful purpose of placing additional texts of *refundiciones* in circulation, where they may be studied and compared to the original. If *refundiciones* are a "nuevo ramo de literatura inventado en España," such editions would provide us, at least, with additional examples.

FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE

ALBERT JOSEPH ULPIEN HENNET,
EARLY FRENCH MILTONIST

By HARRY REDMAN, JR.

IN* FRANCE THE Revolutionary and Napoleonic eras witnessed deep interest in John Milton, especially in his *Paradise Lost* and certain of his prose works. Milton's views on all current issues were cited as oracular utterances. For instance, Mirabeau and J. B. Salaville translated or adapted *Areopagitica* and *Pro Populo Anglicano*; and on November 14, 1792, in the hope that its action would contribute to Louis XVI's conviction and death sentence, the Conseil Général du Département de la Drôme ordered the reprinting of "le livre de Milton relatif à la condamnation de Charles Ier" (See F. A. Aulard, *Histoire politique de la Révolution Française* [Paris, 1926], p. 374). Nor were Miltonic divorce theories overlooked. Early in the disturbances appeared the *Réflexions d'un bon citoyen en faveur du divorce*. Its nameless author dedicated his pamphlet to the National Assembly and listed with his authorities the divorce tracts of Milton; like Milton, who had addressed his own *Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce* to Parliament to remind it that divorce should be allowed in the new political scheme, the author of this tract demanded that France's new constitution include a divorce law. Many such pamphlets appeared. *Du Divorce*, another one, came out in 1789 without the author's name; it had an almost immediate second edition the same year, and the Library of Congress lists a copy dated 1790. The 1792 edition carries the name of the author, Albert Hennet.¹ Meanwhile Hennet's *Pétition à l'Assemblée Nationale* on divorce had been issued in 1791. With other authorities almost too numerous to mention, Hennet in this pamphlet cited Milton's *Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*, translating the title from the 1645 English edition. It is possible that Hennet's introduction to Milton the poet resulted

1. Hennet's first name is sometimes given as *Albin*. For data concerning him see, in addition to his own and other works cited in this article, *Nouvelle Biographie générale*, XXIV (Paris, 1858), 1-3; J. M. Quérard, *La France littéraire*, IV (Paris, 1830), 69-70; and Ernest Fournier de Flaix's notice in the *Grande Encyclopédie*, XIX (Paris, 1893-94), 1071.

from his use of the tract, though, as we shall see, his interest in *Paradise Lost* could well have antedated this.

Who was Hennet? His dates are December 25, 1758, to May 10, 1828. For a future Miltonist, certainly no birth date could have been more auspicious than the one celebrated in Milton's *On the Morning of Christ's Nativity*. Like Chateaubriand and many another with poetic illusions at this time, he wrote occasional bits of verse that appeared in the *Almanach des muses*. Under Necker he entered the government finance service and, despite his private convictions, was able to remain there, weathering all political vicissitudes. When the Revolution came he was prudent but never wavered in his basic attachment to the Bourbons, a circumstance which, when they returned, was to earn him the title *chevalier*. Alarmed when it became known that Louis XVI would be put on trial, Hennet mustered what poetic talent he could and in short order turned out a piece entitled *Louis XVI aux Français or Complainte de Louis XVI*. Heard in Paris to the popular tune of *Pauvre Jacques* while the king's trial was in session, it was no doubt intended to aid the doomed monarch. The police banned it, but months later, when Louis XVI was no more, one still heard it on the lips of indiscreet soldiers in the suspect Armée du Nord.² Not until 1814 did Hennet print it under his own name.

Hennet accepted the transition from monarchy to republic and republic to empire and meanwhile continued to be interested in literature. Conversant with several modern idioms, he had already published a *Nouvelle Grammaire italienne pour les dames* in 1790, and he even composed a short tale in English called *Lorelina, or the First Inoculation*. He soon combined his knowledge of English and his poetic bent and, in 1806, produced a *Poétique anglaise* in three small volumes.³

To illustrate his observations, the author provided extracts from English poetry, which it was his custom to render into French. Numerous examples came from Milton, and one entire chapter was devoted to a discussion of him. General comments on the nature of both French and English verse occur, with occasional allusions to Milton. "Le vers français parle; il plait,

2. F. A. Aulard, "Le Royalisme à l'armée du Nord en juin 1793," *Révolution Française*, XXII (1892), 86-91.

3. Paris, 1806. Quotations from this work will be, as a rule, parenthetically annotated in the text of the article.

émeut, intéresse; il raisonne, il soupire," wrote Hennet. "Le vers anglais chante; il séduit, trouble, entraîne; il gémit, il tonne. L'un a plus de grâce, plus de finesse; l'autre a plus de vivacité, plus de piquant. La monotonie du premier peut tomber en langueur; la rapidité du second peut devenir fatigante."⁴ Hennet extolled Milton's blank verse and declared that the poet had helped make it as respectable as rime (I 88). He liked poetic inversion and cited the initial invocations of *Paradise Lost* and *The Rape of the Lock* as examples of how it can be used as ornament and to enhance idea; he contrasted these invocations with the "rational" but cold

Je chante ce héros qui régna sur la France

of Voltaire's *Henriade*. "Ici, c'est Voltaire qui s'empare de son sujet; là, c'est le sujet qui entraîne Pope et Milton. En français, l'auteur se présente; en anglais, c'est l'ouvrage qui s'annonce" (I 39-41).

From a remark in his book it could be wondered whether Hennet had at one time planned a translation of *Paradise Lost*. In connection with his version of Satan's discourse to Beelzebub and Eve's serenade to Adam, he reveals that he had rendered other selections also, but, with the exception of scattered exempla in *Poétique anglaise*, decided not to make them public when Delille's version of the epic came out.⁵ The translations used nevertheless have merit. It is odd, however, to note that Eve's speech to her husband upon retiring is called "A Virginie" and made to seem a lover's declaration to his mistress, the entire context having disappeared in the French rendering. This Hennet explains with the admission, "Ce sont les premiers vers anglais que j'aie traduits, dans un temps où j'étais loin de penser que je dusse un jour entreprendre un poétique." Perhaps, then, these Milton translations and adaptations went back to those ambitious youthful moments when Hennet was a contributor to the *Almanach des muses*.

4. *Poétique anglaise* I 85-86. Hennet added, "Mais ce caractère national des deux poésies disparaît sous la plume des grands maîtres. Pope, quand il le veut, a la douceur, la correction, l'élégance de Racine. Corneille a toute la fierté, tout le sublime de Milton. Le génie et l'esprit parlent bien dans toutes les langues" (I 86).

5. *Poétique anglaise* III iv-v, 34-37; *PL* I 242-70, IV 639-56. Delille's *Paradis perdu* dates from 1804.

English critical opinion on Milton Hennet knew well and quoted on occasion. French Milton commentaries he mentioned include Voltaire's *Essai sur la poésie épique* and *Lettre à l'Académie Française*, Marmontel's *Eléments de littérature*, and Abbé Antoine Yart's *Idée de la poésie anglaise*. Voltaire, he believed, was superior to Abbé Yart but was blinded by partisan commitments; Yart's work leaves so much to be desired that, in his opinion, it hardly deserves its title (I 2-3). Nor was Hennet any more pleased with French translators of Milton. He alluded without comment to Dupré de Saint Maur's translation, and while he admired Delille's, he said that it was Delille, not Milton, one read and that the poem had not been executed with Delille's usual care (I 1, 15; III 156-157).

Milton's work other than *Paradise Lost* Hennet did not like. He tells his readers that Milton wrote some Latin and Italian poems, and he mentions *Comus*, a sort of "comic opera." *Lycidas* is described as an "élégie assez faible sur la mort d'un ami." *L'Allegro* and *Il Penseroso* are "deux petites pièces légères dont les titres sont italiens." Hennet declines to comment upon *Paradise Regain'd*, which he characterizes as a "faible production de la vieillesse d'un grand homme," adding that his attempts to read it have been in vain. The prose works are dismissed as "misérables pamphlets" (III 157, 154). It is clear that in 1806 Hennet did not care to remember his own earlier use of *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*.

Hennet's attitude toward *Paradise Lost* was another matter, but it was not without its reservations. To Hennet the world's seven great epics were the *Iliad*, the *Aeneid*, the *Lusiads*, *Jerusalem Delivered*, the *Araucana*, the *Henriade*, and *Paradise Lost*. Were he to rank these according to their poetic worth, he declared he would put Milton's third, just after those of Homer and Virgil. Given epic plan as his criterion, he would put it last, he said, but "pour le sublime de la pensée et de l'expression," he would award it first place (I 98-100). "Si l'on considère le *Paradis perdu* comme une suite de scènes imposantes ou pathétiques, de tableaux enchanteurs ou effrayants, c'est sans doute le plus beau des poèmes épiques," he asserted. "Mais, quelle que soit mon admiration pour Milton, la contexture de son poème ne me semble qu'un long délire; la raison, la justice même y sont sans cesse blessées par ce qui sans cesse charme l'esprit et touche le coeur" (III 156). Sentiments of this kind

resemble those of Mme de Staël, who, while she was much impressed with Satan, nonetheless considered the rest of the poem rather incoherent about this time.⁶

Elsewhere Hennet's praise is unstinted and betokens genuine emotional as well as esthetic perception. He was unaware of the term, but Hennet saw Milton as a tormented Romantic driven by restless ideas, "un homme né avec une âme ardente, une imagination exaltée" (III 154). In an inspired poetic outburst he declared, "Le génie de Milton avait besoin d'un sujet qui fût à sa hauteur; son âme toute républicaine ne pouvait chercher ses acteurs chez les rois: la Divinité devint son héros et le ciel son théâtre. Dieu, les anges, les diables, les cieux, les enfers, les armées les plus nombreuses, livrant dans les vastes campagnes de l'air les plus mémorables combats; la naissance de l'univers; les deux premiers humains placés dans un site enchanté, ouvrant par degrés leurs yeux aux merveilles de la nature et leurs sens aux plaisirs de l'amour; la première des amantes parée de tous les charmes épars depuis sur ses nombreuses filles, conduite de surprise en surprise aux jouissances les plus chastement voluptueuses; enfin ces êtres si intéressants, si fortunés, tombant tout à coup du faîte du bonheur dans l'abîme des maux et de l'immortalité à la mort, et la terre recevant pour la première fois les larmes donc elle a été depuis si souvent arrosée; jamais, sans doute, un champ plus vaste, plus varié, plus fécond ne s'offrit à la poésie épique: l'auteur était fait pour son sujet et son style pour ses héros" (III 155-156). Outpourings such as these are characteristic of nascent French Romanticism and prepared the way for Villemain's lyrical *Essai historique sur Milton* of fifteen years later.⁷ While it is too bad that Hennet did not even mention *Arcades* or *Samson* and that his comments on Milton's minor works show so little warmth, his enthusiastic pronouncement upon *Paradise Lost* deserves to be remembered as one of the earliest favorable ones in the annals of French Miltonism.

* For grants permitting him to study Milton's French critics, the author would like to express his thanks to the University of Alabama Research Committee and the American Philosophical Society.

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA

6. *Œuvres* (Paris, 1838), I, 337; *De L'Allemagne*, ed. Comtesse Jean de Pange (Paris, 1958), II, 54.

7. See my article, "Villemain on Milton: A Document in Romantic Criticism," *CL*, X (1958), 241-245.

DU BOS AND MONTESQUIEU: AN INSTANCE OF PROPHETIC VISION

By WARREN GATES

EVERY STUDENT OF Montesquieu is familiar with Henri Barckhausen's *Montesquieu, ses idées et ses œuvres d'après les papiers de la Brède*.¹ Characterized by reviewers as an "essential work," it contains most of Barckhausen's contributions to Montesquieu research, including his article, "Prévisions de Montesquieu," which presents many striking examples of Montesquieu's prophetic vision.² The chapter which embodies this article begins with the arresting sentence: "Les hommes intelligents savent voir, mais les hommes de génie prévoient."

Among the instances of Montesquieu's prophetic power cited by Barckhausen is one already made illustrious by Saint-Beuve in the *Causeries du lundi*.³ It is a prediction that the North American colonies would sooner or later declare themselves free from the British yoke.

Un coup d'œil de divination perce comme un éclair dans cette phrase, jetée en passant, et qui prédit l'émancipation de l'Amérique anglaise. Je ne sais pas ce qui arrivera de tant d'habitants que l'on envoie d'Europe et d'Afrique dans les Indes occidentales; mais je crois que si quelque nation est abandonnée de ses colonies, cela commencera par la nation anglaise.⁴

This prediction seems remarkable for its foresight when we find it in Montesquieu's "Notes sur l'Angleterre," written about 1730 (Montesquieu arrived in England in 1729; in 1731 he returned to La Brède). When we find the same prediction elsewhere, antedating Montesquieu's journey to England by a quarter of a century, it seems an even more perceptive observation.

In the year 1704 the abbé Du Bos published his *Les intérêts de l'Angleterre mal-entendus dans la guerre présente*. This work

1. Henri Barckhausen, *Montesquieu, ses idées et ses œuvres d'après les papiers de la Brède* (Paris: Hachette, 1907), 344 p.

2. Henri Barckhausen, "Prévisions de Montesquieu," *Revue Philologique de Bordeaux et du Sud-Ouest*, X (1907), 241-244.

3. Charles-Augustin Sainte-Beuve, *Causeries du lundi*, 3rd ed. (Paris: Garnier frères, 1850), VII, 60.

4. *Oeuvres complètes de Montesquieu*, ed. Edouard Laboulaye (Paris: Garnier frères, 1875-79), VII, 194.

had already appeared the year before in England, bearing the title, *England's Interest, Mistaken in the Present War*. It purported to be from the pen of a member of the British House of Commons, who loyally offered to his queen some dissenting views concerning the prosecution of the War of the Succession. In this study, the abbé Du Bos makes the prediction which we have seen ascribed to Montesquieu.

Lorsque le continent de l'Amerique Septentrionale . . . seroit peuplé de sept cent mille Anglois, et que les Comtez du Nord où la terre n'est déjà que trop peu cultivée, en seront restez en friche: Comment en userions-nous avec ce nouvel Etat? En permettrions-nous le commerce aux Etrangers? Laisserions-nous nos compatriotes Americains, vivre libres des impôts que nous payons icy, et se gouverner suivant les Loix qu'ils trouveroient bon de faire, au mépris des Actes du Parlement d'Angleterre? Leur permettrions-nous d'établir chez-eux des Manufactures, et de trafiquer avec les Etrangers? Si nous prenions ce parti, l'Angleterre tireroit peu d'avantage de sa nouvelle conquête . . . Il faudroit y continuer les impôts . . . en un mot le gouverner suivant les maximes que Philip II. a laissées pour régir l'Amerique Espagnole. Mais si nous voulions imposer un joug si pesant à un pays florissant, comme le seroit le Mexique Anglois, il seroit bien à craindre qu'il ne le secouât, étant éloigné de deux mille lieues de ses maîtres. Le pouvoir ne luy manqueroit pas, et il en auroit bien-tôt la volonté.⁵

It seems particularly fitting that the praise lavished upon Montesquieu for this felicitous prophecy should really belong to Du Bos, for elsewhere Sainte-Beuve has treated Du Bos rather cavalierly. His only actual mention of Du Bos is a reference to his services as Perpetual Secretary to the *Académie Française*, where he dismisses him lightly as *insignifiant*.⁶

In repeating the prophecy made by his fellow Academician, Montesquieu seems by his very choice of words to establish a claim to it as an original conception. It is interesting to speculate upon a possible explanation for this circumstance. When Montesquieu was in England, according to one of his editors, "perhaps his most valuable acquaintance was Pierre Coste, a refugee Frenchman, who had translated Locke . . ."⁷ Apart from being the translator of Locke's famous *Essay on Human Understanding*, Pierre Coste was associated with the English philosopher

5. Jean-Baptiste Du Bos, *Les intérêts de l'Angleterre mal-entendus dans la guerre présente*, 6th ed. (Amsterdam, J. Louis de Lorme, 1704), pp. 249-251.

6. Sainte-Beuve, *Causeries*, XIV, 204.

7. *The Spirit of Laws*, "Editor's Introduction," trans. Thomas Nugent, ed. Franz Neumann, The Hafner Library of Classics, IX (New York: Hafner, 1949), p. xii.

as his personal amanuensis. The abbé Du Bos had a very friendly relation with Locke, who sent him "les bonnes feuilles" of Pierre Coste's translation before their publication, as a special mark of esteem.⁸ If Pierre Coste shared his employer's esteem for Du Bos, as seems probable, since the "bonnes feuilles" in question were his own work, then he was quite likely to be familiar with Du Bos' writings. He may well have discussed Du Bos' prediction with his friend, Montesquieu. Perhaps Montesquieu emerged from the conversation with the impression that he himself had contributed the prophetic observation concerning England's American colonies to the discussion.

However this may have been, it would have been plain to Montesquieu's contemporaries, had they been permitted to read the prediction, that this prophecy had already been widely discussed in connection with Du Bos' work before Montesquieu was out of adolescence. Unfortunately, Montesquieu's contemporaries never saw the "Notes sur l'Angleterre," which first appeared in print in 1818.⁹ D'Alembert mentions the bold predictions made by the abbé Du Bos in his controversial *Intérêts de l'Angleterre* in the *Histoire des membres de l'Académie Française*, where, in the *éloge* devoted to Du Bos, he refers to him as the *Ecrivain Prophète*.¹⁰

Another of Montesquieu's contemporaries has noted that the abbé Du Bos predicted the separation of the American colonies from England more than fifty years before the event. About one half of the article which Voltaire allots to Du Bos in the *Catalogue des écrivains du siècle de Louis XIV* consists of an appreciation of this *tour de force*.

Il publia, pendant la guerre de la succession, un ouvrage intitulé *les Intérêts de l'Angleterre, mal-entendus dans la guerre présente*. Il y prédit la séparation des colonies anglaises, comme la suite nécessaire de la destruction de la puissance française dans l'Amérique septentrionale, du besoin qu'aurait l'Angleterre d'imposer des taxes sur ses colonies, et du refus qu'elles feraient de se soumettre à ces taxes.¹¹

Two of Du Bos' biographers have noted the prediction of

8. Alfred Lombard, *L'Abbé Du Bos: Un initiateur de la pensée moderne (1670-1742)* (Paris: Hachette, 1913), p. 73.

9. Barckhausen, *Montesquieu*, p. 278, n.l.

10. Jean le Rond d'Alembert, *Histoire des membres de l'Académie Française morts depuis 1700 jusqu'en 1771* (Amsterdam: Montard, 1787), V, 7.

11. *Oeuvres complètes de Voltaire*, ed. Louis Moland (Paris: Garnier frères, 1878), XIV, 57.

the revolt of the colonies against British rule in the *Intérêts de l'Angleterre*, without seeming to know that the prediction is also made by Montesquieu. Alfred Lombard declares that the prediction explains why the work continued to be remembered after the War of Succession had ceased to be a timely topic of interest.¹² Paul Peteut, another of Du Bos' biographers, refers to the prophecy without noting that it is also to be found in Montesquieu, although he is at some pains to note that Montesquieu has used ideas to be found in another of Du Bos' works, *Les Quatre Gordiens*.¹³

For more than two hundred and fifty years, Du Bos' happy prediction has intrigued all who have encountered it, whether in his *Intérêts de l'Angleterre* or in the "Notes sur l'Angleterre" of Montesquieu. It is indeed true, as Barckhausen observed, that "the intelligent man sees, the genius foresees." One does not often find such an interesting prevision as this, which has charmed such "hommes de génie" as Voltaire and Sainte-Beuve, as well as the numerous "hommes intelligents" who have come upon it with pleasure.

PFEIFFER COLLEGE

12. Lombard, *Du Bos*, p. 107.

13. Paul Peteut, *Jean-Baptiste Du Bos: Contribution à l'histoire des doctrines esthétiques en France* (Tramelan: Zachmann-Vuille, 1902), p. 23.

A SPANISH COLLECTION OF EMBLEM BOOKS

By KARL-LUDWIG SELIG

OF* ALL THE extant inventories of private libraries of the Spanish golden age, there can be little doubt that one of the most extensive and interesting is the following:

Joseph Maldonado y Pardo, *Museo, o Biblioteca de el Exc.^{mo} Señor Don Pedro Nuñez de Guzmán, Marqués de Montealegre*, Madrid, 1677.¹

Some years ago, A. Rodríguez-Moñino, in a series of articles in the *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia* (CXXVI, 1950, 427-92, CXXVII, 1950, 307-344, 561-627, CXXVIII, 1951, 219-44), published those portions of the catalogue which pertain to manuscript material.

In the present note, we should like to discuss the portions of the inventory dealing with emblem books, for they disclose one of the richest collections of emblem books to have been noted in a Spanish private library of the period. This may also serve as another indication of the vast popularity and vogue of emblem literature in the seventeenth century.

There are two sections in the inventory devoted to *emblemata*: part I, chap. 7 (pp. 22-23): "Symbola, Hieroglyphica et Emblemata", and part II, chap. 21 (p. 97): "Varias empresas y emblemas, y libros de medallas". The first section contains about fifty items, among which we note works by the following authors: Alciato (of course!), the commentaries to Alciato by Francisco Sánchez, Minois, and Diego López, Boxhorn, Juan de Borja, Camerarius, Caussin, Giovio, Juan Horozco y Covarrubias, Hermann Hugo, Hadrianus Junius, Mercier, Paradin, Pietrasanta, Reusner, Saavedra Fajardo, Sambucus, Schoonhovius, Simeoni,

* I should like to express my sincerest appreciation to Dr. Stanley Pargellis and the Newberry Library for kindly permitting me to consult this rare catalogue during my tenure as Fellow of this distinguished Library in the summer of 1958.

1. Consult especially Fernando Huarte Morton, "Las bibliotecas particulares españolas de la edad moderna", *Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos*, LXI, no. 2, 1955, 555-76 and Archer Taylor, *Book Catalogues: Their Varieties and Uses* (Chicago: The Newberry Library, 1957). I hope to prepare an edition of the Nuñez de Guzmán catalogue at an early date.

Solórzano Pereyra, Hernando de Soto, Taurellus, Typotius, Vaenius, Giovanni Pierio Valeriano, and Villava.² It is curious to note that in the same section we also find listed the pseudo-treatise on hieroglyphs by Joannes Goropius Becanus and four of the vastly popular books on aspects of the occult by the Jesuit Athanasius Kircher.

The second section is shorter and lists eight emblem books: Saavedra Fajardo, Juan de Borja, Solórzano Pereyra, Villava, Horozco y Covarrubias, Hernando de Soto, Alciato translated by Diego López, and Paolo Giovio in the translation of Alonso de Ulloa. These are, however, all items listed earlier.

Not so strange at all, a section on numismatics is appended containing four treatises, among them the well-known translation by Juan Martín Cordero of Roving's work, and the *Museo de las medallas desconocidas españolas* by Lastanosa, Gracián's patron.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

2. For the identification of these emblem books, consult Mario Praz, *Studies in Seventeenth-Century Imagery*. Vol. II. *A Bibliography of Emblem Books* (London, 1947).

THE 'TERRIBLE MOTHER' IMAGE IN CALDERON'S *ECO Y NARCISO*

By EVERETT W. HESSE

ECO Y NARCISO, a mythological tragedy, has not received the critical attention it deserves, perhaps because many scholars have regarded it as just another court spectacle written for the occasion of princess Margarita's birthday.¹ It is that and much more. It dramatizes the tragic tale of the unrequited love of Eco and Narciso, the result of the mistaken notion of a proud mother guided by self-interest, and by her sense of guilt and dishonor brought about by those natural forces she seeks to repress in her son, the fruit of an illicit union. Because of his isolation from society since birth and his ignorance of social intercourse, Narciso is unable to cope with the problems of life. His mother has taught him nothing about life outside the dank, dark interior of the cave where he has learned only how to use the human endowment of speech. She has not instructed him in the facts of life and when he falls in love with Eco, his mother's unwise discipline and rigorous upbringing make it impossible for him to shake off these bonds which hinder his self-realization and prevent his integration into society by marriage to one of its kind. In fact he falls in love with his own image reflected in a pool of water, mistaking it for a water sprite. He has become emotionally incapable of making Eco the object of his affection, and, her love unrequited, the nymph dies of a broken heart.

Narciso's self-love may be traced directly to the unwholesome influence of the "terrible mother"² who has deliberately reared her son in a cave isolated from the rest of the world and in a virtual state of ignorance concerning life and society. She foolish-

1. See my article, "Courtly Allusions in the Plays of Calderón," *PMLA*, LXV (1950), 543-544. The play has been reprinted in recent years in *Las cien mejores obras de la literatura española*, Vol. 96. Prólogo de Angel Valbuena Prat (Buenos Aires, n.d.).

2. The psychological concept of the "terrible mother" is discussed by C. G. Jung in his remarkable work, *Psychology of the Unconscious*, Trans. B. M. Hinkle (New York, 1952), *passim*. He shows the influence of the domineering mother "of whom many traces are found in mythology." See especially pp. 243 and 367.

ly tries to hide Narciso, the fruit of her sinful love affair with Céfiro, in order to protect her reputation. Moreover, she vainly tries to thwart the prophecy made by the *magos*, Tiresias, that her son's undoing will be due to a *voz* and an *hermosura*. Thus by isolation she attempts to prevent Narciso from succumbing to the power of love as she had done. But she does not realize that love frustrated in one direction may find an outlet in another, e.g. self-love.

The joyous singing from Eco's birthday party has reached Narciso's ears and lured him to the rock which limits his freedom. Liríope, his mother, admonishes him not to leave the cave. The control Liríope has been exercising over her son does not prevent him from demanding his freedom from parental restraint. In a long speech Narciso attempts to justify his demand on the basis of a *natural* phenomenon. First he points out that a mother bird ejects her young from the nest when their wings are strong enough to enable them to fly. He also indicates that a lioness expels the young cubs from the lair as soon as they are able to shift for themselves. Then Narciso applies the analogy to himself:

Pues, ¡por qué, madre, me quitas
la libertad, y me niegas
don que a sus hijos conceden
una ave y una fiera,
patrimonio que da el cielo
al que ha nacido en la tierra? (576 c)³

The mother has broken the great chain of being which Nature grants to all its creatures and this violation of a natural law portends only catastrophe for the hapless Narciso whose innate desire for female companionship aroused by the chorus is frustrated by a fearful mother. Liríope cannot seem to understand that Narciso's problem was precisely the one she experienced in the pre-stage action when she fell victim to the amours of Céfiro and she is determined to prevent a repetition of her own situation.

In search of quarry to be used as a birthday gift for Eco, Anteo stumbles upon Liríope whom he takes for an "humano monstruo." This is significant because she is garbed in animal skins and her external appearance reflects her inner bestiality. When her bow breaks, Liríope fights Anteo with her bare hands,

3. Edition consulted: *Comedias de don Pedro Calderón de la Barca*. "Biblioteca de Autores Españoles." Tomo IX (Madrid, 1881).

thus showing her fierce nature. In desperation she vainly summons

la otra mitad de mi vida,
Narciso! (577 c)

The working out of the prophecy made in Act I by Tiresias, the Wise Old Man so often found in myths, that Narciso's end will be caused by "una voz y una hermosura" (579 c), now begins to take shape. Under the spell of music and of ascendant Eros the stage is now set for the first meeting of the two protagonists. There is a violent eruption of emotions in Narciso as he sees Eco, the first woman to excite his sexual desires. She is really only the second woman he has seen and in the rest of the play Narciso will exercise a mother-beloved conflict which will ultimately be one of the factors bringing about the catastrophe.

The linguistic style here is in accord with Narciso's emotional upheaval. He is left "dudoso, absorto, suspenso" by her appearance. This confusion and this absorption are expressed in the conventional polaric terms of water (his thirst) and fire (his love). But the desire for love is stronger than that for water; the former overshadows the latter and replaces it in the metaphor:

¿Cómo de una sed y otra
tanto has trocado el afecto,
que en vez que labies y oídos
beban agua y aire, has echo
que beban fuego los ojos? (581 a)

That Calderón intended the play as a dramatization of the biological urge is to be seen also in the language. When Narciso asks who Eco is, she replies "una mujer." That Eco too is driven by the sexual urge is evident in the pointed question Narciso asks her:

Pues ¿cómo en este desierto
a quien no conoces buscas?
¿Usase en el mundo eso
de que busquen las mujeres
a quien no conocen? (582 a)

This also underlines the fact brought out later that Eco is not only desirous of a mate, but that she will propose first. When Narciso is reunited with his mother, he no longer wishes to embrace her but only Eco. After the protagonists have left the stage, Bato the *gracioso* expresses his opinion to the other shepherds and shepherdesses that mother and son are savages. A

shepherdess explains that they are simply "una mujer y un hombre."

Since the illiterate and uneducated might consider the fable as truth, and also to satirize the stupidity of a man old enough to fall in love but incapable of distinguishing between a man and his reflection, Calderón puts into the mouth of the *gracioso* this line

¡y habrá bobos que lo crean! (594 c)

Frazer suggests that it was unlucky and even fatal to see one's own reflection.⁴ The superstition flourished in various parts of the world and held that a person's reflection in water or in a mirror was his soul. The Greeks believed that the water spirits could drag a person's soul under water, thus causing him to perish.

But there is another aspect of the myth which does not appear in any of the known sources of the legend that I have consulted in Ovid and Pausanias. And this is Calderón's contribution to what otherwise might have been an insipid and mediocre dramatization of the mythological tale. That the dramatist was fully aware of his character's motivation is corroborated by the detailed account he has given concerning the reason why Narciso falls in love with his own image. Despite the moments of mirth and laughter occasioned by the jokes of the clown, and despite the repetitious allusions to Margarita's birthday, it seems to me that the real import of the play for the modern reader is the over-riding power of the "terrible mother" image on the innocent and naïve son and the tragic consequences of her action, her credence in the prophecy and her misapprehension. The main theme of unrequited love is directly dependent upon the repressive influence of the mother in warning her son about the danger of yielding to the passion of love.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

4. Sir James G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough: A Study in Magic and Religion*, abridged edition (New York, 1958), pp. 222-223.

A FRENCH DRAMATIST'S VIEW OF GERMANY IN 1656

By JOHN VAN EERDE

RABELAIS, Marot, Monluc, Du Bellay, Henry Estienne and Montaigne attest to a well established French interest in many aspects of Italian life during the Renaissance. On the other hand, before the eighteenth century, French impressions of neighbors to the north and east are sparse in literature. Of England the first comprehensive report is Misson's *Mémoires et observations d'un voyageur en Angleterre*, published in 1698, following a few sketchy remarks made earlier in the century by other Frenchmen. The detail of Montaigne's remarks on Germany in the *Journal de voyage* is unusual for the period, covering German kitchens, meals, costumes and bed-rooms. And yet, as Charles Dédéyan has pointed out, the main preoccupation of the essay is with intellectual matters.¹ B. Munteano goes so far as to write "Point d'Allemagne aux yeux des Français jusque vers 1795."²

Occasional references to Germany in such writers as Descartes or Dr. Guy Patin are exceptions to the rule of neglect applicable to that country in seventeenth-century French literature.³ All the greater, therefore, is the interest of a vignette of German manners in the first scene of *Le Cercle des femmes* (1656), a play written by the much-traveled Samuel Chappuzeau.⁴ One of the play's characters, Lycaste, has been in England and Ger-

1. Charles Dédéyan, *Essai sur le journal de voyage de Montaigne* (Paris, n.d.), p. 62: "Mais sa prédilection pour l'Allemagne repose surtout sur des motifs intellectuels."

2. Review of Jean-Marie Carré's *Les Ecrivains français et le msrge allemand* (1947), *RLC*, XXII (1948), 148.

3. Descartes writes of troop movements in Germany, but thinks of it especially as a place for his own meditations in *Dissertatio de methodo*, in *Oeuvres* (Paris, 1941), VI, 545: "Eram tunc in Germania . . . totos dies solus in hypocausto morabar, ibique variis meditationibus placidissime vocabam." Patin writes of Germany in *Relations de voyages* (Paris, 1674).

4. Samuel Chappuzeau, *Le Cercle des femmes* (Paris, 1663). Henry Carington Lancaster points out Chappuzeau's indebtedness to Erasmus in this and other scenes of the play in *A History of French Dramatic Literature in the Seventeenth Century* (Baltimore, 1936), Part III, I, 122-123.

many, both of which he criticizes for requiring a lover of good wine to drink beer.⁵ However, it is on the subject of Germany that he becomes really voluble. He contrasts the warm reception at a Lyon inn described by his friend Alidor with that to be expected in Germany:

Personne ne vous salue en arriuant; car ils croiroient faire chose indigne de la grauité Allemande. Apres s'estre, egorgé de crier, il parest à la fin quelqu'un qui auance la teste hors de la petite fenestre du Poëble, où ils demeurent volontiers iusqu'au solstice d'Esté; Et vous le prendriez proprement pour une tortue qui se mōtre de dessous sa coque. C'est de celuy là qu'il faut s'informer s'il y a place dans l'hôtellerie, & s'il ne dit mot, vous pouuez entrer: Car ils n'ont pas en ces pays là tant de caquet que vos Lyonoises. En suite il vous montre l'étable de la main, & il vous est permis d'y traiter vōtre cheval à vōtre mode, pour de valet il n'y en a point, à moins que ce ne soit un logis fameux.

Covered with mud and filth, much of it acquired while looking after the horse, the traveler makes his way to a sort of common-room to find eighty or ninety people crowded together. These will include a motley group: horsemen, pedestrians, merchants, sailors, monks, soldiers,—both men and women, the healthy and the sickly. The scene is a Babel. This one combs his hair, that one tries to clean his mud-caked clothes, another changes his shirt and still another belches a garlic-laden whiff into the atmosphere. A foreigner is liable to be stared at as if he were some strange animal from Africa.

Another of Lycaste's complaints has to do with the lack of air on such an occasion: "Au reste ils croyent vous bien traiter, s'ils vous font suer à grosses gouttes; & si quelqu'un n'étant pas acoutumé à cette vapeur ose entr'ouurir seulement un volet; il entend aussi-tost: Fermez. S'il repart, i'étoufe, ie n'en puis plus; il entend derechef: si ce logis ne vous plaist pas, cherchez-en un autre."

Naturally, Lycaste has something to say about the eating

5. Chappuzeau himself shows a disdain for limitation in the matter of beverages. He writes of the theatre in Paris, in *Les Théâtre françois* (Lyon, 1674), Livre III, 123-124: "On y tient l'esté toutes sortes de liqueurs qui rafraichissent, des limonades, de l'aigre de cèdre, des eaux de framboise, de groseille et de cerise, plusieurs confitures sèches, des citrons, des oranges de la Chine: et l'hyver on y trouve des liqueurs qui réchauffent l'estomac, du rosolis de toutes les sortes, des vins d'Espagne et de Sciontad, de Rivesalte et de Saint-Laurens. J'ay veu le temps que l'on ne tenoit dans les mêmes lieux que de la bière et de la simple ptisane, sans distinction de romaine et de citronnée, mais tout va en ce monde de bien en mieux, et de quelque costé que l'on se tourne, Paris ne fut jamais si beau ny si pompeux qu'il l'est aujourd'huy."

habits and the food of this country. He indicates that, arriving, after four in the afternoon, one must not expect to eat before nine or ten o'clock. He attributes this to German frugality. Apparently normal travel ended by mid-afternoon.⁶ Later arrivals found no food waiting for them, since nothing was prepared until it was felt that the day's last traveler had arrived: "Alors l'on void entrer un vieux Ganymede, qui étend les nappes que vous diriés être tissées du chanure des vieux cordages de quelque vaisseau, & met autant de couverts comme il a conté de bouches. Chacun après se place où bon luy semble, vû qu'il n'y a point là de distinction entre le pauvre & le riche, entre le maître & le seruiteur. De la sorte vous demeurez assis prez d'une heure auant que les viandes viennent." A Frenchman of the time, in whose country there prevailed distinctions not only between master and servant, but between servant and servant, would certainly have noticed such a democratic seating arrangement.⁷

No one tries to accelerate the service: "Enfin le vin arrive: mais bon Dieu, quel vin! Il en faudroit de semblable à des Sophistes tant il est acre & subtil. Que si quelqu'un offre en secret de l'argent pour en avoir de meilleur, ils dissimulent d'abord de vous entendre; mais d'un visage qu'ils semblent vous vouloir tuer. Si vous les pressez, vous en avez à la fin cette reponce: Tant de Comtes, & de Marquis ont logé céans, & personne ne s'est iamais plaint du vin; Si ce logis ne vous plaît pas, cherchez-en un autre." As for the food ". . . je ne vous en puis rien dire, sinon qu'elle est tres mauvaise, ne consistant qu'en de chairs salées, & potages rechaufez."⁸

6. However in the same author's *Les Eaux de Pirmont* (1669), Géronte tries to hasten his daughter's suitor, of whom he disapproves, on the way to Poland, assuring him that in Germany there is transportation that keeps going day and night (1,4)—see Chappuzeau, *Les Eaux de Pirmont*, ed. J. H. Widerholt (Geneva, 1671). Germany produced the berlin carriage in 1660, after the composition of *Le Cercle des femmes*, but before the writing of *Les Eaux de Pirmont*.

7. For a recent study of the master-servant relationship in seventeenth-century French comedy see my article, "The Historicity Of The Valet Role In French Comedy During The Reign Of Louis XIV", *RR*, XLVIII (October, 1957), 185-196.

8. Another seventeenth-century writer, La Mothe Le Vayer, suggests that German food was not uniformly coarse in this period when he notes that in Germany the "grosses viandes" are served after the dainty food. See La Mothe Le Vayer, Lettre XVII, "Des Festins et des Parasites," in *Des Petits Traitez en formes de lettres*, in *Oeuvres* (Paris, 1669), X.

German cleanliness, which commands fairly universal respect these days, was not observed by Lycaste. According to him, German beds are filthy, the sheets looking as though they have not been washed for six months.⁹

Such is Chappuzeau's unflattering picture of tourism in what was called Germany in his day. This playwright was not automatically hostile to other nationalities, for in *Colin-Maillard* (1662), he speaks flatteringly of the Flemish. And he was not a chauvinist, for his very flattery of the Flemish is used to reproach his compatriots by comparison.¹⁰ Finally, it must be recognized that Germans themselves may well have sided with much French criticism of their homeland, so completely did they admire the French: "French clothes, French dishes, French furniture, French talk, French manners, French sins, French diseases even, are all the rage."¹¹

The late interest of French writers with regard to Germany has been noted above. Such remarks as Lycaste's come too soon to belong to a tradition. Baldensperger, although pointing out in his article, "Le Classicisme français et les langues étrangères," that Saint-Simon, Patin, Descartes and d'Ablancourt knew German, that La Bruyère could use it as a tool and that Bossuet may have known it, emphasizes the presence of Germans in France rather than of Frenchmen in Germany.¹² That German manners, such perhaps as those depicted by Chappuzeau, kept the two races apart is evident in Baldensperger's observation: "C'est moins une barrière linguistique, dirait-on, qu'une incompatibilité de manières qui paraît gêner la diffusion de l'allemand dans les milieux distingués."¹³

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND

9. It is hard to believe that conditions were much better in France. Egon Friedell writes of the period in *A Cultural History of the Modern Age*, trans. Charles F. Atkinson (New York, 1954), II, 105: "On the score of cleanliness much was lacking even in the highest circles . . . and even the Sun-King's bed had its bugs."

10. G ron te, disdaining French candidates for his daughter's hand in *Les Baux de Pirmont*, states, "Ha s'il se pr sentait de braves Allemands,/Qui sur tous les humains sont fid les amans" (I,6).

11. Christian Thomasius. Quoted in Friedell, p. 118.

12. Fernand Baldensperger, "Le Classicisme fran ais et les langues  trang res," *RLC*, XIII (1933), 14-42.

13. Baldensperger, p. 37.

BOSSUET AND JANSENISM

By C. G. CHRISTOFIDES

SPECULATIONS THAT Bossuet was pro-Jansenist have persisted among the Bishop's bibliographers, originating in objectively critical historians, anti-Gallican critics and the Jansenists themselves. The first suspicions of Bossuet's alleged Jansenism were aired during the Quietist controversy, in the closing years of the seventeenth century. The Archbishop of Paris, Noailles, wrote then to Fénelon: "Avant ce malheureux temps de division, auriez-vous cru qu'on pût soupçonner seulement M. de Meaux de favoriser Jansénius? Il aurait bien oublié les leçons de M. Cornet, qui l'a élevé."¹ Nicolas Cornet, the famous master at the Collège de Navarre, had, in 1649, extracted from the *Augustinus* of Jansenius the five propositions condemned by Rome. Bossuet eloquently recalled this fact in the funeral oration for his former teacher in 1663.

Fénelon may have been the originator of the idea that Bossuet was a Jansenist. He had already accused the Bishop (to Mme de Maintenon) of violating the secrecy of Mme Guyon's confession. This accusation, not in the Hugolian tradition of "Bossuet est féroce et Fénelon est tendre," is not surprising if a secret memorandum which Fénelon sent the Pope in 1705 is considered, in which he is accusing cardinals, bishops, monastics, princesses, ministers and magistrates of leaning toward Jansenism.²

According to the *Mémoires* of Louis Le Gendre (1655-1734), Louis XIV (not the most mystical of French kings), who made no pretense at hiding his anti-Jansenism, is supposed to have reproached Bossuet for treating Jansenism as a phantom. It has been reported that the Bishop said nobly: "Il y a des choses que la conscience ne permet pas de faire." But these assertions are inconclusive: Bossuet has never been accused of Protestantism for not crushing the Huguenots in 1685.

The Jansenists also took part in spreading the belief that the Bishop of Meaux was one of their own. After Bossuet's death,

1. François Fénelon, *Oeuvres complètes* (Paris, 1851), V, 413.

2. Ferdinand Brunetière, *Etudes critiques sur l'histoire de la littérature française* (Paris, 1894), IV, 156-157.

Pasquier Quesnel, who had assumed the leadership of the party after the deaths of Arnould (1693) and Nicole (1695), published his own *Réflexions morales*. Bossuet had been amending this work, under instructions from the Archbishop of Paris, to make it acceptable to orthodox readers. Quesnel's new title of *Justification des réflexions morales* (passed off as Bousset's revision), did not account for the fact that at no time had Bossuet written a "justification" of Quesnel's book. The two manuscript copies of Bossuet's corrections of the *Réflexions* at the Bibliothèque Nationale have as their title the word "Avertissement".

In the nineteenth century, Joseph de Maistre wondered as to the motive that seemed to deprive Bossuet of all his strength in the face of Jansenism. His conclusion, in *De l'église gallicane* (Bk. II, ch. 2), is that no Thomist can ever treat Jansenism as an enemy. But are Jesuits not Thomists also? Alfred Rébelliau, in *Bossuet, historien du protestantisme*, alleges that beginning in 1668, Bossuet was the protector and friend of the gentlemen from Port-Royal, and that voluntarily he gave them his approval in 1669 for the publication of Nicole's *Perpétuité*; that Nicole and Arnould defended Bossuet's writings against the Protestants, and he theirs.³ According to the Abbé Le Dieu, Bossuet's secretary and biographer, however, Bossuet was acting with the official sanction of King and Archbishop, as censor of Jansenist books: "Tout cela se faisait par ordre exprès du roi" (*Mémoires*, p. 124).

Both Rébelliau and de Maistre equate Thomism with Jansenism in trying to prove that Bossuet, an "Augustinian" Thomist, must have been a Jansenist at heart. The judgment is rash. What these historians may be doing is confusing Bossuet's Gallicanism with Jansenism. The point of contact between Jansenism and Gallicanism obviously was the common view on the relationship between Church and state. When during the Assembly of the French Clergy of 1682, mainly under Bossuet's aegis, the autonomy of the Church in France was asserted against Rome, Bossuet was faced with a choice between Caesar and Pope; he chose the former: such was the attachment to the throne of France of the most literary and systematic exponent of the "divine right" theory. The four articles issued by the Assembly, it must be remembered, proclaimed the superiority of Church

3. Paris, 1909, p. 298.

councils over the pope; denied pontifical infallibility; subordinated papal decisions, even in matters of faith, to the approval of the national Churches; rendered worthless in France all papal decrees of which the Assembly of the French Clergy, that is Louis XIV, did not approve. The penalty paid for the endorsement of these articles was that "the last of the Church Fathers" never became a cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church.

Brunetière went so far as to say in *Jansénistes et cartésiens*: "Et si nous retrouvons jusque dans les *Sermons* de Bourdaloue la trace visible de l'influence du jansénisme, est-il nécessaire de montrer qu'elle est plus visible encore dans les *Sermons* de Massillon et dans *l'oeuvre entière* de Bossuet? Sauf un ou deux cas, on pourrait presque dire que Bossuet, dans la question de la doctrine, a évité de se prononcer sur le sujet du jansénisme. A tout le moins s'en faut-il beaucoup qu'il l'ait jamais attaqué comme il fit le protestanisme ou le quietisme."⁴ In the sixth volume of his *Études critiques*, Brunetière reproduces a *Notice* which was also inserted in the *Grande Encyclopédie* in 1888, where he asserts that Bossuet's only anti-Jansenist pronouncements were the funeral oration of Nicolas Cornet; a long letter to the Abbess of Port-Royal [this tragic controversy has been beautifully dramatized by Montherlant]; and the maxims on the theatre (pp. 229-230). Brunetière is forgetting some of Bossuet's most important pronouncements against Jansenism: the *Oraison funèbre du père Bourgoing* of 1662, the letter to the Maréchal de Bellefonds written on December 1, 1674, the *Sermon de Pâques* preached at court in 1681, Bossuet's amendments of Quesnel's *Réflexions morales*, the *Mémoire* to the King in 1700 against the Jansenists, and the Bishop's role in the Assembly of the Clergy in 1700 when he firmly fought for the condemnation of certain Jansenist propositions which he called scandalous and schismatic.

It is puzzling also that Brunetière wrote: "Il n'est douteux en aucune façon que Bossuet approuvât presque de tous points la morale du jansénisme. Il a eu l'âme vraiment et profondément janséniste."⁵ Brunetière's eagerness to make of Bossuet a Jansenist may be attributed to the critic's desire not to disturb his thesis that in the seventeenth century three influences

4. Brunetière, *Études critiques*, IV, 164-165.

5. *Ibid.*, VI, 230.

dominate ideas: Cartesianism, Jansenism and the philosophy of Molière; as if the century is not an eminently Catholic one with Bossuet, Massillon, Bourdaloue, de Bérulle, and Saint Vincent de Paul. No doubt Bossuet had excellent relations with some Jansenists, as he had with Protestants. But his attitude toward both groups was the same: he considered them misled brethren who must be brought back into the Church.

In his book on Bossuet (Paris, 1894), Lanson contradicts himself twice in three pages. Page 199: "En général, par la sévérité de sa morale, Bossuet se rapproche des jansénistes . . . D'autant qu'en préparant la condamnation de la morale relâchée des Jésuites . . . il semble animé de l'esprit des *Provinciales*." Page 201: "Il approuve, il défend les doctrines des Jésuites . . . Il blâme même la morale des jansénistes; il s'éloigne d'eux autant que des casuistes indulgents." Page 200: "Il admirait, il aimait Arnauld et Nicole . . . il voyait en eux d'illustres et vaillants défenseurs de l'Eglise." Same page: "Il est contre eux où ils se séparent de . . . l'Eglise. Toute son admiration aboutit alors à les condamner." Lanson further states: "Il est certain aussi que Bossuet estimait Jansénius et Saint-Cyran, qu'il permettait même la lecture à des religieuses" (p. 200). Bossuet was writing on May 14, 1695, to Sister Cornuau, concerning the *Lettres* of Saint-Cyran: "Elles sont d'une spiritualité sèche et alambiquée. Je n'en attends aucun profit pour la personne que vous savez . . . je ne les ai jamais conseillées et permises."⁶

The final decision on whether to assign Bossuet to the Jansenist camp must necessarily rest on the Bishop's view of grace. Bossuet interpreted Augustine's concept of grace in the light of the latter's *Spiritu et littera*, Paul's First Timothy, ch. II, 4 ("God desires all men to be saved"), and the Pelagians. In Book XIII of the *Défense de la tradition et des saints Pères*, Bossuet explains that if by "God desires" one means God's will to save, providing man conforms to His commandments, then "all men" must be interpreted literally. If, however, one equates an arbitrary will with God's desire to save, then "all men" must refer to those elected by this arbitrary will. Bossuet goes on to explain that in citing Saint Paul's verse, Augustine was an exponent of salvation for both the elect and all mankind. Augustine, argues Bossuet, needed the "elect" theory to oppose the

6. Jacques-Bénigne Bossuet, *Correspondance* (Paris, 1925), VII, 87-88.

Pelagians who denied that God may have wished to save a pre-determined number of men.

When further confronted with Augustine's "We know that the grace of God has not been given to all men," Bossuet answers that "saint Augustine s'est trompé." The man who chose the Church over Saint Augustine, on a point where Augustinian doctrine and Jansenism meet, could hardly have chosen to side with the Jansenists against Rome.

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

VARIATIONS OF A SPANISH ADAPTATION OF A BURCHIELLO SONNET

By JOSEPH G. FUCILLA

ALTHOUGH THERE IS apparently no published evidence on the influence of Burchiello in Spain, the large number of sixteenth century Italian editions of his poems that were available to Spaniards of the Renaissance and Golden Age suggest the possibility that eventually something of considerable value will turn up. What we have to contribute at this time is slight, but it is a beginning: a sonnet-imitation of his curious *Dice Bernardo a Christo* . . . one of his most popular compositions.¹ The Spanish poem in question is to be found in the Magliabechiano manuscript, VII, 353, in the Biblioteca Nazionale in Florence, a very substantial anthology of a miscellaneous character. An anonymous annotator has, as a matter of fact, detected the Burchiello source, and so indicates it in a marginal notation. Herewith is a copy of the sonnet as it appears in the collection:

Dixo un Portero al Papa, aquí ha llegado,
Señor, un hombre de perversa vida,
traydor, ladrón, pirata y omicida,
que de su hermana y madre mal ha usado.

El Santo Sacramento ha profanado
y a dos Obispos les quitó la vida,
a dos Papas veneno en la comida
por pocos intereses les a dado.

A echado las reliquias en el fuego,
haze burla de todo el invisible,
¿podráse perdonar tanta insolencia?

Respondió el Papa, sí, con tal que luego
se case que es la cosa más terrible
que se puede dar en penitencia.

(fol. 9v)

In its printed form in the Venice 1553 edition, p. 93, which was very likely the one utilized as a model, the Burchiello poem runs as follows:

Disse Bernardo a Christo; e' ci è arrivato,

1. Cf. Renier, "Nota aggiunta alla illustrazione del Cod. Parmense, 1081," *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana*, XII, 1888, 314, who here remarks: "Popolarissimo è stato il sonetto in dispregio delle donne che com. *Disse San Bernardo* . . ."

Signor mio caro, un peccator cotale,
 Arso egli ha Chiesa, e rubato Spedale,
 Uomo micidiale è sempre stato;
 E tutto il tempo suo t'ha bestemmiato;
 Sforzò la Madre, ed ha fatto ogni male;
 Uccise un Prete il giorno di Natale;
 Potrebbe punir questo peccato?

A San Bernardo rispondette Christo:
 Non per viaggi, nè per digiunare,
 Non per orare, o piangere, o star tristo;
 Ma digli, che se Moglie vuol pigliare,
 Io lo porrò allato a Giambatisto,
 Se quella pena in pace vuol portare:
 Bernardo, non pensare,
 Che 'l soffrir della Moglie egli è gran doglia,
 Perchè ella stessa non sa che si voglia²

The chief distinction between the two sonnets just cited is that in his *remaniement* the Spanish imitator softens the tone of the original a bit by transferring its locale from heaven to earth, that he multiplies the crimes committed by the sinner, and that he does not make use of a *coda*. Otherwise the imitation fairly successfully competes with its Italian exemplar in the verve which is infused into the half-humorous misogynistic diatribe.

There are six other Spanish versions known to me, all of them anonymous like our Magliabechiano composition. As the variants are both interesting and numerous it may be worth reproducing the poems at this point so as to make possible an on-the-spot comparison, and, at the same time, an appreciation of the whimsicalities in each of the adaptations.

The first, drawn from a Biblioteca Nacional Matritense manuscript, 198, fol. 72, has appeared in *Revue Hispanique*, XVIII, 1908, p. 611, in "237 Sonnets," a collection put together by Foulché-Delbosc.

Dixo un portero al Papa, aquí ha llegado,
 Señor, un hombre de malvada vida,
 ladrón, traydor, perjuro y omicida,
 que a su madre y ermanas ha forçado.
 El santo sacramento ha profanado,
 a un obispo dió muerte conocida,
 a dos Papas ponçoña en la bebida
 por muy poco interese les ha dado.

Ha echado las reliquias en el fuego,

2.I am especially indebted to Prof. L. H. Gordon for the reference to the 1553 edition as well as for the transcript of the version that appears in it.

tiene por burla todo lo invisible.
¿Podráse perdonar tanta insolencia?

Responde el Papa: sí con tal que luego
tome mujer y sufra si es posible
tan agradable mal en penitencia.

The second, drawn from Manuscript 305 in the same library also appears in "237 Sonnets" (p. 611).

Dixo un portero al Papa, aquí ha llegado,
Señor, un hombre de malvada vida,
traydor, ladrón, herético, homicida,
que a sus padres y hermanos muerte ha dado.

Quatro o cinco sagrarios ha robado,
a su patria en son de paz dexta vendida,
a tres papas ponçoña en la comida
por vil y baxo precio él ha echado.

Arrojó unas reliquias dentro un fuego,
hizo burla de todo lo invisible.
¿Puedese perdonar tal insolencia?

El Papa dixo: sí, con tal que luego
tome muger y sufra si es posible
tan insufrible mal en penitencia.

A third comes from *Variedad de Sonetos recogidos de diferentes autores por Ignacio de Toledo, año 1627*, vol. I, fol. 221, a manuscript presently in the Biblioteca antequerana de la caja de ahorros, Antequera, Spain.³

Dixo un portero al Papa, aquí a llegado,
Señor, un hombre de muy mala vida,
ladrón, herético, traider i omicida,
que a su madre i hermanos muerte a dado.

El santo sacramento a profanado
y dió muerte a un obispo no entendida,
y a tres Papas veneno en la comida
de su cudicia i interés llebado.

A echado las reliquias en el fuego,
hace, burla de todo lo visible,
¿puedese perdonar tal insolencia?

El Papa dixo, sí, con tal que luego
tome mujer i sufra si es posible
tan insufrible carga en penitencia.

Our fourth version in Ms. 19387, fol. 79, in the Biblioteca

3. This sonnet is omitted by Dámaso Alonso and Rafael Ferreres in their edition of the Ignacio de Toledo manuscript—*Cancionero Antequerano: 1627-1628*, Madrid, 1950. For the location of the manuscript I am indebted to Prof. López Estrada of the University of Seville.

Nacional Matritense, shows that the poem had migrated as far as Mexico.⁴

Dixo un portero al Papa, aquí a llegado,
Señor, un hombre de malvada vida,
traidor, ladrón, erético, omisida,
que a su madre y ermano muerte a dado.

El santo sacramento a profanado,
y a un santo obispo le quitó la vida,
y a tres Papas ponsoña en la comida
por muy [poco] dinero les a echado.

A puesto las reliquias por el suelo,
ase burlado de todo lo invisible.
¿Puédese perdonar esta insolencia?

El Papa dixo, sí, con tal que luego
tome muxer i sufra si es posible
tan insufrible mal en penitencia.

Our fifth happens to be a seventeenth century manuscript, Ms. 18, 706, fol. 138v., in the British Museum.

Dixo un portero al Papa, aquí a llegado,
Señor, un hombre de malvada vida,
ladrón, traydor, erético, omicida,
que a su padre y hermanos muerte a dado.

El sancto sacramento a profanado,
y a un cardenal dió muerte no entendida,
y a dos Papas ponçoña en la comida
por muy pequeño precio les a echado.

A echado las reliquias en el fuego,
haze burla de todo lo invisible,
¿y puédese perdonar tal insolencia?

El Papa dixo, sí con tal que luego
tome mujer y sufra si es sufrible
tan insufrible mal en penitencia.

In our final version, also in the British Museum, Add. Ms. 10, 257, the criminal is presented to the Pope by a *datario* instead of a *portero*. Its handwriting is of the eighteenth century.

Dijo un Datario al Papa, aquí a llegado,
Señor, un hombre de perversa vida,
traydor, ladrón, erético, homicida,
que a su Padre y Hermanos muerte a dado.

El sacramento santo a profanado
y de su madre a sido matrizida,
y a dos Papas veneno en la comida
por muy poco dinero les a dado.

Ha puesto mil reliquias en el fuego

4. A note made by Gayangos on this manuscript reads: "Escrito en gran parte en México. Letra de los años 1598 a 1612 y siguientes."

y en nada tiene todo lo invisible.
¿Podráse permitir tal insolencia?

El Papa dijo, sí, con tal que luego
este se case y pase si es posible
tan insufrible mal en penitencia.

It appears that either the poem in the Magliabechiano manuscript or the one in the Madrid Biblioteca Nacional, Ms. 198, has been based directly upon the Burchiello original. The others seem to represent adaptations of one of these two, and among them, the version which is probably chronologically the last is the one that substitutes the *datario* for the *portero*. Though the satirical-comical contents of the imitation are innocuous, they could hardly have met with the approval of the Inquisitorial Censor. Hence it is unlikely that any of the versions cited is apt to appear in the printed collections of the time.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

A CASE OF SYMBOLIC SYNTAX IN THE *CHIEVREFUEIL*

By GERALD KAMBER

THE LAY OF Marie de France that " 'Gotelef' l'apelent Englois, 'Chievrefueil' le noment François."¹ is particularly eventful in its narration. Merely a fragment of the primitive legend,² it recounts: 1) the love between Tristram and the Queen Iseut (who is not named in the text); 2) King Mark's anger at his nephew Tristram; 3) Tristram's exile in Wales; 4) his clandestine return to Cornwall; 5) the ruse by which he obtains news of the queen; 6) the banishment of the barons from the court³; 7) the means whereby he attracts the queen's attention in the forest; 8) some reflections on the union of honeysuckle and hazel trees; 9) the lover's tryst; 10) their emotion at taking leave from each other; and 11) the fact that Tristram composed a lay on the subject. All this in a poem of only 118 lines.

At a point exactly two thirds into the narration⁴, there shine forth two verses of astonishing poetic beauty:

'Bele amie, si est de nos:

Ne vos sanz moi, ne moi sanz vos!' (ll. 77, 78)⁵

This oft-quoted passage stands out from the body of the text by the simplicity of its language, by its symmetry, and because it is the only example of direct discourse in a poem which, after all, is about the problem of communication. All the words, moreover, except *amie* are monosyllabic, a phenomenon rarely en-

1. *The Lays of Marie de France*, ed. R. W. Linker, Chapel Hill, 1947, p. 61, ll. 115, 116.

2. For a discussion of the primitive legend and of its successive versions, see the interesting resume of Denis de Rougemont, *Love in the Western World (L'Amour, et l'Occident)* (New York, 1957), pp. 4-47.

3. This episode does not figure in the *Chievrefueil*; these barons are evidently the ones who informed King Mark of his nephew's guilty love for his queen.

4. The 77th and 78th verses out of a total of 118. The device of dividing a poem into fractions and of having an important verse fall exactly on one of them or in the very middle was rather widespread during the Middle Ages. As a matter of fact, we know relatively little about the processes of medieval numerology.

5. Linker, *op. cit.*, p. 60, ll. 77, 78.

countered in the works of Marie de France and the sole example of this lay.

Bele and *amie*, as much by their meaning as by their phonetic structure, belong to that class of words generally considered sensual or caressing. Phonetically, they consist of sonorous consonants, labial and lateral liquids, and open or, at least, dark vowels. Normally, they are also part of the vocabulary of emotion. Even *nos*, *vos*, *moi*, and *ne*, used in connection with them, seem to participate in the overall atmosphere of suavity.

An analysis of *bele* discloses that it is composed of a sonorous, bi-labial plosive, plus an open 'E', plus a liquid dental. Its last syllable, *-le*, the mute 'E' being very weak, blends into the 'A' of *amie* nearly in the manner of a definite article. The metre too contributes to this effect for, in order to count the eight feet: "be / le / a / mi / e / si / est / de / nos," either the second or the fifth syllable must be eliminated and it seems quite unlikely that the vowel would be eliminated before the cesura.

Even though *bel(e)* *ami(e)* had become the commonest of linguistic commonplaces, by going back far enough one can unravel the traces of two distinct semantic levels. *Bel(e)*, which had always been associated with the idea of physical beauty, also designated, from a very early period, spiritual beauty thus equating beauty and goodness.⁶ In the word *ami(e)*, the idea of romantic love is joined to that of friendship. This double significance adds therefore an important objective dimension to the subjective intimacy of passion.

The words *bel(e)* and *ami(e)*, evidently feminine in this context, have exactly the same phonemes in modern French whether masculine or feminine. Even in Old French, they were probably pronounced in such a fashion as to suggest both genders, thus transcending distinctions of sex by their sympathetic vibration and harmonizing in an oxymoric polarity that basic opposition between male and female.

The adverb *si*, abundant in French literature of the Middle Ages, is encountered only three times in the course of the text,

6. Without going all the way back to Plato and the long Scholastic tradition, this reminds us of Eulalia who "bel ariet corps/belezour anima."

7. I want to express my thanks to Professors Spitzer, Hatcher, and Coleman of the Johns Hopkins University, who in various ways contributed to the conception of this paper.

once before (1. 58), and once after (1. 110) the passage in question. "Si est de . . .", that is: *si*, plus an impersonal verb, plus *de* (one of the great problems of Old French syntax) is nowhere in evidence except in the lines we are examining. A single *ne*, encountered three times early in the Ms. (ll. 18, 21, and 30), suddenly occurs doubled in our passage, and then no more throughout the lay. This might tend to indicate that certain turns of phrase, frequently found in Old French, are purposely avoided in this lay and then placed far from our passage, in order to throw them into relief when they do occur.

The reader is now able to see how the phrase is constructed. A positive *si* at the head of a clause had a specific function in Old French: it affirmed that the listeners would be in accord with what the speaker was about to say. Because of its affirmative quality, it fairly draws along with it the copula *est*, verb which more than any other points out the existence of a particular reality. *De*, coming between the verb *être* and the pronoun *nos* however, separates them rather than connecting them. One could easily imagine a more compact construction, *c'est nos*, for example. This separation creates a tension which provokes movement in an otherwise static relationship, i.e., the union of the lovers designated in final position by the *nos*.

The next phrase is even richer in implications. Here the *ne* functions as the first element in a negative equilibrium (somewhat like the *ni . . . , ni . . .* of modern French always ending in total contradiction, i.e., *ni l'un, l'autre*). Then *sanz*, a strong negative preposition, cancels out the word which follows it. This gives us a chiasmus whose formula may be enunciated: *ne - sanz, ne - sanz*. That is to say, in this perfectly equilibrated clause, *sanz* doubles the negative twice so that the clause assumes the proportions of a powerful positive affirmation, rendered that much more powerful because immobilized by the absence of a verb.

These pronouns are clearly the two most fundamental ones of all language since they denominate that initial stage of human consciousness, the *moi*, and then the first contact with an outside being, the *vos*. Aside from the elemental quality of these pronouns, they are also disjunctives, emphasizing vigorously the characters they designate and the emphasis is intensified by the juxtaposition of super-personal pronouns with the impersonal *ne* and *sanz*.

('Ne vos sanz moi') seems perhaps to decompose into its individual elements the unified *nos* of the preceding phrase. But by means of a marvelous inner symmetry, the two negatives cancel each other out and what remains is a kind of distillation of that emotional unity, fruit of the lover's identification with the beloved. The anticipated second *ne*, leading to a repetition of these four monosyllables, with only the order of the pronouns reversed, brings the tension of the poem to its highest pitch and simultaneously resolved it.

The opening salutation introduced a moral aspect into a physical attribute and injected the dignity of reason into the passion of sensual love. The somewhat fatalistic "si est de nos" first refers to the immemorial union between the honeysuckle vine and the hazel tree, and then extends this comparison to the tie that binds the lovers so that their love appears absolute. The second verse however actually surpasses it, singing the very opposite situation, but as an impossibility, in a symmetrical declaration composed of a pair of double negatives juxtaposed with a pair of disjunctive pronouns in alternation. This creates a neat, closed circle both descriptive of and, at once, *symbolic* of the perfect reciprocity existing between two lovers. Not only do the words themselves describe the love, but, both by sense and disposition in the phrase, become the very symbol of the union between Tristram and Iseut as well as of that union which binds vine to tree.

GOUCHER COLLEGE

AN EXAMPLE OF THE PREPOSITION "DANS" IN 1516

By R. L. FRAUTSCHI

IT IS GENERALLY acknowledged that the preposition "dans" (de + ens or enz < INTUS) was utilized infrequently until the second portion of the sixteenth century.¹ The rapid acceptance of "dans" toward the end of the century can be attributed to its repeated use by Ronsard, among others,² as well as the need to curb the proliferation of forms using "en" (< IN) before the definite article: *en le: el, ou, on; en les: es*. If the rare examples of this preposition in medieval texts³ contrast with its more generalized usage by the end of the sixteenth century, of interest is the presence of the term, given its forthcoming extension, in a text dated 1516.⁴

The word occurs once in Pierre Gringore's adaptation in prose and verse of the *Gesta Romanorum*, *Les Fantassies de Mere Sotte*, in the third stanza of the ballad introducing Part VIII, "De Reformation de Paix et de la Vengeance de ceulx qui la rompent:"

(1. 37) "Cuidant tenir princes *dens* ses charroys."⁵ The preposition remains unaltered in all editions of *Les Fantassies* prior to the text published by Alain Lotrain c. 1530 (Musée Condé, Chantilly, n° 857). In this edition, the last to include the introductory ballad to Part VIII celebrating the peace treaties of 1516 (i.e. Noyon, Concordat), the preposition is spelled "dans."

1. F. Brunot and C. Bruneau, *Précis de grammaire hist. de la langue fr.* (Paris, 1949), p. 432; O. Bloch and W. von Wartburg, *Dict. étym. de la langue fr.*, I (Paris, 1949), 199. See also W. von Wartburg, *Franz. Etymol. Wörterbuch*, 4 (Basel, 1952), 783; A. Ewert, *The Fr. Language* (London 1933), p. 266, §463.

2. M. Françon, *Leçons et notes sur le xvi^e siècle* (Cambridge, Mass., 1959), p. 21; cf. G. Gougenheim, *Mélanges Huguette* (1941), pp. 97-109.

3. See, for example, Littré, *Dictionnaire*, II (Paris, 1883), 952; Darmesteter and Hatzfeld, *Dictionnaire*, I (Paris, 1924), 621.

4. E. Huguette (*Dict. . . . xvi^e siècle*, 2, 704) lists only examples of "dans" as a temporal locution.

5. B. N., Rés. Ye 291. For a description of the editions of *Les Fantassies* see E. Picot, *Sotties*, II, 203-12; A. Tchermizine, *Bibliographie*, VI (Paris, 1932), 80-90.

The stability of the term indicates that it was, at least, tolerated by succeeding editors.

A further example of "dans," contemporaneous with Ronsard's first use of this preposition, is found in the 1550 Corrozet and l'Angelier edition of du Bellay's *L'Olive*, LXXIX:

(1. 12) "Le ciel courbé se mire *dans* ses yeulx."⁶

Curiously, the use of "dens" in eight editions of *Les Fantasies* prior to 1530 suggests that Gringore and his editors may have considered the preposition as a derivative of DE INTUS (i.e. dedans) and, as was common in the sixteenth century, gave the tonic syllable a latinized spelling.⁷ Alain Lotrain, du Bellay and

7. Ch. Beaulieux, *Hist. de l'orthographe fr.*, I (Paris, 1927), 279.

Ronsard, on the other hand, write "dans," implying an acceptance of the preposition as a popular French form, if not their travails with phonetic versus etymological systems of orthography.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

6. In *Oeuvres*, H. Chamard, ed., I (Paris, 1908), 94.





| | | |
|--|--------------------|-----|
| <i>Note sur la Collaboration de Théophile Gautier au Monde Dramatique de Nerval en 1835.</i> | Pierre Guedenet | 113 |
| <i>The Nineteenth Century Spanish Refundiciones as Literature.</i> | H. L. Ballew | 117 |
| <i>Albert Joseph Ulpien Hennet, Early French Miltonist.</i> | Harry Redman, Jr. | 122 |
| <i>Du Bos and Montesquieu: an Instance of Prophetic Vision.</i> | Warren Gates | 127 |
| <i>A Spanish Collection of Emblem Books.</i> | Karl-Ludwig Selig | 131 |
| <i>The 'Terrible Mother' Image in Calderón's Eco y Narciso.</i> | Everett W. Hesse | 133 |
| <i>A French Dramatist's View of Germany in 1656.</i> | John Van Eerde | 137 |
| <i>Bossuet and Jansenism.</i> | C. G. Christofides | 141 |
| <i>Variations of a Spanish Adaptation of a Burchiello Sonnet.</i> | Joseph G. Fucilla | 146 |
| <i>A Case of Symbolic Syntax in the Chievrefueil.</i> | Gerald Kamber | 151 |
| <i>An Example of the Preposition Dans in 1516.</i> | R. L. Frautschi | 155 |

ROMANCE NOTES is published in Autumn and Spring by the Department of Romance Languages, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina. Annual subscription, \$2.25. Single copies, \$1.25.

Contributions of approximately six double-spaced typewritten pages (including footnotes) are welcome. They should conform to the MLA Style Sheet and should be accompanied by stamped return envelope.

All communications should be addressed to the Managing Editor, Box 350, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

Copyright 1960 by the University of North Carolina.



